THE Doctrine of the TRINITY AND Transubstantiation COMPARED, AS TO Scripture, Reason, and Tradition.

In a New DIALOGUE between a *Protestant* and a *Papist*.

The First Part.

WHEREIN

An ANSWER is given to the late Proofs of the Antiquity of Transubstantiation, in the Books called *Consensus Veterum*, and *Nubes Testium*, &c.

The Second Edition.

IMPRIMATUR.

Ex Ædib. Lambeth. Jan. 17. 1686. Guil. Needham RR. in Christo Pat. ac D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.

LONDON, Printed for *W. Rogers* at the *Sun* over against St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleet-street*. MDCLXXXVIII.

The Doctrine of the Trinity *and* Tranſubſtantiation *compared, as to* Scripture, Reaſon, *and* Tradition. *In a New Dialogue between a* Proteſtant *and a* Papiſt.

Pr. I Remember your laſt Words at parting were, *Farewel; and God give his holy Spirit to inſtruct you.* Which have run much in my Mind: For if the *holy Spirit inſtruct us,* what need is there of an Infallible Church? I hope thoſe were not only words of courſe with you.

Pa. No; but I meant that the *holy Spirit ſhould inſtruct you* about the Authority of the Church.

Pr. Was this indeed your meaning? Then you would have me believe the Church Infallible, becauſe the *holy Spirit* which is *Infallible* will inſtruct me about it, if I ſeek his Directions.

P. Yes.

Pr. But then I have no Reaſon to believe it; for the *holy Spirit* after my ſeeking *his Inſtructions,* teaches me otherwiſe. And if the *holy Spirit* is Infallible which way ſoever it teaches, then I am *infallibly ſure* there is no ſuch thing as *Infallibility* in what you call the *Catholick Church.*

P. Come, come; you make too much of a ſudden Expreſſion at parting; I pray let us return to our main buſineſs, which is to ſhew, that there is *the ſame Ground from Scripture, Reaſon, and Tradition, to believe Tranſubſtantiation,*

ſtantiation, as there is to believe the Trinity. And this I affirm again, after reading the *Anſwers* to the former *Dialogue*; and I now come ſomewhat better prepared to make it out.

Pr. So you had need. And I hope I ſhall be able not only to defend the contrary, but to make it evident to you, that there is a mighty difference in theſe two Doctrines, as to *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Tradition*. But I pray keep cloſe to the Point: for I hate impertinent triffing in a Debate of ſuch Conſequence.

P. I muſt confeſs, I over-ſhot my ſelf a little in the former Dialogue, when I offer'd to prove the Doctrine of the *Trinity unreaſonable and abſurd:* For no Church can make ſuch a Doctrine, which is unreaſonable and abſurd in it ſelf, not to be ſo to me; No Church can make *three and one to be the ſame, if they be repugnant in themſelves.* But my meaning was, that Mens Diſputes about theſe things will never be ended, till they ſubmit to the *Authority* of the *Church.*

Pr. And then they may believe *three, or three hundred Perſons* in the *Trinity*, as the Church pleaſes. Is that your meaning?

P. No. But I ſaid *to my Carnal Reaſon* it would appear ſo; but not to my Reaſon as under the Conduct of an *Infallible Guide.*

Pr. Then an *Infallible Guide* can make *three hundred to be but three*; which is a notable trick of Infallibility.

P. No; I tell you I meant only that we are not to follow *Carnal Reaſon*, but the *Church's Authority*, *i. e.* we are not to ſearch into Myſteries above Reaſon, but only believe what the Church delivers. And I intend now to argue the Point ſomewhat cloſely with you. Do you believe that there are any Myſteries in the Chriſtian Doctrine above Reaſon, or not? If not, you muſt reject the *Trinity*; if you do, then you have no ground for rejecting

ing

ing *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe it is above Reaſon.

Pr. You clearly miſtake us; and I perceive were very little acquainted with our Doctrine: for we do not reject any Doctrine concerning God, meerly becauſe it is above our Reaſon, when it is otherwiſe clearly proved from Scripture. For then we own our ſelves bound to ſubmit in matters of Divine Revelation concerning an Infinite Being, though they be above our Capacity to comprehend them. But in matters of a *finite Nature*, which are far more eaſie for us to conceive, and which depend upon the Evidence of Senſe, we may juſtly reject any Doctrine which overthrows that Evidence, and is not barely *above our Reaſon*, but *repugnant* to it.

P. I do not well underſtand you.

Pr. So I believe; but I will endeavour to help your Underſtanding a little. And I pray conſider theſe things:

1. That there is a great difference in our Conceptions of *Finite* and *Infinite* Beings. For, whatſoever is *Infinite*, is thereby owned to be above our Comprehenſion, otherwiſe it would not be Infinite. The Attributes of God which are eſſential to him, as his Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power, muſt be underſtood by us, ſo far as to form a true Notion of that Being which is Infinite; but then the *Infinity* of theſe Attributes is above our reach. And ſo his *Infinite Duration*, which we call *Eternity*; his Infinite Preſence which we call his *Immenſity*; the *Infinite Extent* of his *Knowledg*, as to future Contingencies; all theſe muſt be confeſſed to be *Myſteries*, not above our Reaſon, but above our Capacity. For we have great Reaſon to own them, but we have not Faculties to comprehend them. We cannot believe a God, unleſs we hold him to be Infinite in all Perfections: and if he be Infinite, he muſt be incomprehenſible; ſo that Religion muſt be overthrown, if ſomething incomprehenſible be not allowed. And as to finite Beings, ſo far as they run into what we

we call *Infinite*, they are ſo far out of our reach; as appears by the inſuperable Difficulties about the Infinite Diviſibility of Quantity.

2. That we have certain Notions of ſome things in the viſible World; both that they are, and that they have ſome Attributes eſſential to them. We daily converſe with things viſible and corporeal; and if we do not conceive ſomething true and certain in our Minds about them, we live in a Dream and have only Phantaſms and Illuſions about us. If we are certain that there are real Bodies, and not meer Appearances, there muſt be ſome certain way of conveying ſuch Impreſſions to our Minds, from whence they may conclude, this is a Horſe, and this a Man, and this is Fleſh, and this Blood, and this is Wood, and this Stone; otherwiſe all certainty is gone, and we muſt turn meer Scepticks.

3. That in examining the ſenſe of Scripture we may make uſe of thoſe certain Notions of viſible things which God and Nature have planted in us; otherwiſe we are not dealt with as Reaſonable Creatures. And therefore we muſt uſe thoſe Faculties God hath given us, in reading and comparing Scriptures, and examining the ſenſe that is offered by ſuch Notions which are agreeable to the nature of things. As for inſtance, the Scripture frequently attributes *Eyes* and *Ears* and *Hands* to the *Almighty*: muſt we preſently believe God to have an Human Shape becauſe of this? No; we compare theſe with the neceſſary Attributes of God, and from thence ſee a neceſſity of interpreting theſe Expreſſions in a Senſe agreeable to the Divine Nature. So if other Expreſſions of *Scripture* ſeem to affirm that of a *Body* which is inconſiſtent with the Nature of it; as, that it is not viſible, or may be in many Places at once, there is ſome Reaſon for me to underſtand them in a Senſe agreeable to the Eſſential Properties of a Body.

4. There

4. There is a difference between our not apprehending the manner how a thing is, and the apprehending the impoſſibility of the thing it ſelf. And this is the meaning of the diſtinction of Things *above our Reaſon*, and *contrary to our Reaſon*. If the Queſtion be, how the ſame individual Nature can be communicated to three diſtinct Perſons? We may juſtly anſwer, we cannot apprehend the manner of it, no more than we can the *Divine Immenſity*, or an *Infinite Amplitude* without *Extenſion*. But if any go about to prove there is an impoſſibility in the thing, he muſt prove that the Divine Nature can communicate it ſelf no otherwiſe than a finite individual Nature can: For all acknowledg the ſame common Nature may be communicated to three Perſons, and ſo the whole Controverſie reſts on this ſingle Point as to Reaſon; whether the Divine Nature and Perſons are to be judged and meaſured as Human Nature and Perſons are. And in this, I think we have the advantage in point of Reaſon of the *Anti-trinitarians* themſelves, although they pretend never ſo much to it.

P. Good night, Sir; I perceive you are in for an hour; and I have not ſo much time to ſpare, to hear ſuch long Preachments. For my part, talk of *Senſe* and *Reaſon* as long as you will, I am for the *Catholick Church*.

Pr. And truly, ſhe is mightily obliged to you for oppoſing her *Authority* to *Senſe* and *Reaſon*.

P. Call it what you will, I am for the *Churches Authority*; and the talk of *Senſe* and *Reaſon* is but *Canting* without that.

Pr. The matter is then come to a fine paſs; I thought *Canting* had rather been that which was ſpoken againſt *Senſe* or *Reaſon*. But I pray, Sir, what ſay you to what I have been diſcourſing?

P. To tell you truth, I did not mind it; for as ſoon as I heard whither you were going, I clapt faſt hold of the

Church, as a Man would do of a Maſt in a Storm, and reſolved not to let go my hold.

Pr. What! altho you ſhould ſink together with it.

P. If I do, the Church muſt anſwer for it; for I muſt ſink or ſwim with it.

Pr. What Comfort will that be to you, when you are called to an account for your ſelf? But if you ſtick here, it is to no purpoſe to talk any more with you.

P. I think ſo too. But now we are in, methinks we ſhould not give over thus; eſpecially ſince I began this Dialogue about the *Trinity* and *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Pr. If you do, we know the Reaſon of it. But I am reſolved to puſh this matter now as far as it will go; and either to convince you of your Miſtake, or at leaſt to make you give it over wholly.

P. But if I muſt go on in my Parallel, I will proceed in my own way. I mentioned three things, *Scripture, Reaſon, and Tradition.* And I will begin with *Tradition.*

Pr. This is ſomewhat an uncouth Method; but I muſt be content to follow your Conduct.

P. No, Sir, the Method is very natural; *for in Myſteries above Reaſon, the ſafeſt way is to truſt Tradition. And none can give ſo good account of that as the Church.*

Pr. Take your own way: but I perceive *Tradition* with you is *the Senſe of the preſent Church*; which is as hard to conceive, as that a *Nunc ſtans* ſhould be an eternal Succeſſion.

P. As to comparing *Tradition*, I ſay, *that the Myſtery of the Trinity was queſtioned in the very Infancy of the Church, and the Arians prevail'd much againſt it in the beginning of the fourth Age; but Tranſubſtantiation lay unqueſtion'd and quiet for a long time; and when it came into debate, there was no ſuch oppoſition as that of* Arius, *to call in queſtion the Authority of its Tradition; the Church received it unanimouſly, and in that Senſe continued till raſh Reaſon attempted to fathom the unlimited Miracles and Myſteries of God.* Pr.

Pr. I ſtand amazed at the boldneſs of this Aſſertion: But I find your preſent Writers are very little vers'd in *Antiquity*; which makes them offer things concerning the Ancient Church, eſpecially as to *Tranſubſtantiation*, which thoſe who had been modeſt and learned, would have been aſhamed of.

P. I hope I may make uſe of them to juſtify my ſelf, tho you ſlight them, I mean the *Conſenſus Veterum*, the *Nubes Teſtium*, and the ſingle *Sheet about Tranſubſtantiation.*

Pr. Take them all, and as many more as you pleaſe, I am ſure you can never prove *Tranſubſtantiation* to have been, and the *Trinity* not to have been the conſtant Belief of the Primitive Church.

P. Let me manage my own Argument firſt.

Pr. All the Reaſon in the World.

P. My Argument is, *That the Doctrine of the Trinity met with far more Oppoſition than Tranſubſtantiation did.*

Pr. Good Reaſon for it, becauſe it was never heard of then. You may as well ſay, the *Tradition* of the Circulation of the Blood lay very quiet, from the days of *Hippocrates* to the time of *Pariſanus*. Who was there that oppoſed things before they were thought of?

P. That is your great Miſtake; for *Tranſubſtantiation* was very well known, but they did not happen to ſpeak ſo much of it, becauſe it was not oppoſed.

Pr. But how is it poſſible for you to know it was ſo well known, if they ſpake not of it?

P. I did not ſay, they did not ſpeak of it, but not ſo much, or not *half ſo expreſs*; *becauſe it is not cuſtomary for Men to argue unqueſtionable Truths.*

Pr. But ſtill how ſhall it be known that the Church received this Doctrine *unanimouſly*, if they do not ſpeak expreſly of it? But ſince you offer at no Proof of your Aſſertion, I will make a fair offer to you, and undertake to prove, That the Fathers ſpake *expreſly againſt it.*

P. How is that? *Expresly against it?* God forbid.

Pr. Make of it what you please, and answer what you can: I begin with my Proofs.

P. Nay, then, we are in for all Night. I am now full of business, and cannot hearken to tedious Proofs out of the Fathers, which have been canvassed a hundred times.

Pr. I will be as short as I can; and I promise you not to transcribe any that have hitherto written, nor to urge you with any spurious Writer, or lame Citation at second or third hand; and I shall produce nothing but what I have read, considered, and weighed in the *Authors themselves.*

P. Since it must be so; let me hear your doubty Arguments, which I cannot as well turn against the *Trinity*; For that is my Point.

Pr. I leave you to try your Skill upon them. The first shall be from the Proofs of the Truth of *Christ's Incarnation*; and I hope this will not hold against the *Trinity.* And those Arguments which they brought to prove Christ *Incarnate*, do overthrow *Transubstantiation* effectually. So that either we must make the Fathers to reason very ill against *Hereticks*; or, if their Arguments be good, it was impossible they should believe *Transubstantiation.* For can you suppose that any can believe it, who should not barely assert, but make the force of an Argument to lie in this, that the Substance of the Bread doth not remain after Consecration? And this I now prove, not from any slight inconsiderable Authors, but from some of the greatest Men in the Church in their time. I begin with St. *Chrysostom*, whose Epistle to *Cæsarius* is at last brought to light by a learned Person of the *Roman* Communion; who makes no question of the Sincerity of it, and saith, *The Latin Translation which only he could find entire, was about five hundred years old*; but he hath so confirm'd it by the *Greek Fragments* of it, quoted by Ancient *Greek* Authors, that there can be no suspicion left concerning it.

P.

P. What means all this ado before you come to the Point?

Pr. Becauſe this *Epiſtle* hath been formerly ſo confidently denied to be St. *Chryſoſtom*'s; and ſuch care was lately taken to ſuppreſs it.

P. But what will you do with it now you have it?

Pr. I will tell you preſently. This *Epiſtle* was written by him for the ſatisfaction of *Cæſarius* a Monk, who was in danger of being ſeduced by the *Apollinariſts*.

P. What have we to do with the *Apollinariſts*? Do you think all hard words are akin, and ſo the affinity riſes between *Apollinariſts* and *Tranſubſtantiation*?

Pr. You ſhall find it comes nearer the matter than you imagined. For thoſe *Hereticks* denied the Truth of the Human Nature of Chriſt after the Union, and ſaid that the Properties of it did then belong to the *Divine Nature*; as appears by that very Epiſtle.

P. And what of all this? Do we deny the truth of Chriſt's Human Nature?

Pr. No; but I pray obſerve the force of his Parallel. He is proving that *each Nature in Chriſt contains its Properties*; for, ſaith he, *as before Conſecration we call it Bread, but after it by Divine Grace ſanctifying it through the Prayer of the Prieſt, it is no longer called Bread, but the Body of our Lord, altho the nature of Bread remains in it; and it doth not become two Bodies, but one Body of Chriſt; ſo here the Divine Nature being joyned to the Human, they both make one Son, and one Perſon.*

Sicut enim antequam ſanctificatur panis, panem nominamus, divinâ autem illum ſanctificante Gratiâ, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus eſt quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus eſt Dominici Corporis appellatione, etiamſi natura Panis in ipſo permanſit, & non duo Corpora, ſed unum Corpus Filii prædicatur, ſic & hic divina ἐνιδρυμένου (ἐνιδρυμένης in Græc. Exemplar. Ep. Bigot.) id eſt inundante Corporis Natura unum Filium, unam Perſonam utraq; hæc fecerunt.

P. And what do you infer from hence?

Pr. Nothing more, but that the *Nature of Bread* doth as certainly remain after *Conſecration*, as the *Nature* of *Chriſt* doth after the *Union*.

Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and Repreſented, 2 *Part. ch.* 3. *p.* 23.

P. Hold a little. For the Author of the ſingle Sheet, ſaith, *That the Fathers by Nature and Subſtance do often mean no more than the natural Qualities, or viſible Appearances of Things.* And why may not St. *Chryſoſtom* mean ſo here?

Pr. I ſay, it is impoſſible he ſhould. For all the Diſpute was about *the Subſtance*, and not about *the Qualities*, as appears by that very Epiſtle; for thoſe *Hereticks* granted, that Chriſt had all the *Properties* of a Body left ſtill; they do not deny that Chriſt could ſuffer, but they ſaid, the Properties of a Body after the Union belonged to the *Divine Nature*, the Human Nature being ſwallowed up by the Union. And therefore St. *Chryſoſtom*, by *Nature*, muſt underſtand *Subſtance*, and not *Qualities*; or elſe he doth by no means prove that which he aimed at. So that St. *Chryſoſtom* doth manifeſtly aſſert the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* to remain after *Conſecration.*

P. But doth not St. *Chryſoſtom* ſuppoſe then, that upon Conſecration, *The Bread is united to the Divinity, as the Human Nature is to the Divine*; elſe what Parallel could he make?

Pr. I will deal freely with you by declaring, that not St. *Chryſoſtom* only, but many others of the *Fathers*, did own the Bread after Conſecration to be made the *real Body of Chriſt*; but not in your Senſe, by changing *the Subſtance* of the *Elements* into that Body of Chriſt which is in Heaven; but by a *Myſtical Union*, cauſed by the *Holy Spirit*, whereby the Bread becomes *the Body of Chriſt*, as that was which was conceived in the Womb of the Bleſſed Virgin. But this is quite another thing from *Tranſubſtantiation*; and the Church of *England* owns, that after Conſecration, *The Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

P. But altho this be not *Tranſubſtantiation*, it may be ſomething as hard to believe or underſtand.

Pr.

Pr. By no means. For all the difficulties relating to the taking away *the Substance* of the Bread, and the *Properties* of Christ's Body, are removed by this *Hypothesis.*

P. Let us then keep to our Point: but methinks this is but a slender appearance yet; St. *Chrysostom* stands alone for all that I see.

Pr. Have but a little Patience, and you shall see more of his mind presently. But I must first tell you, that the *Eutychians* afterwards were condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon* for following this Doctrine of *Apollinaris*; and that Council defines, *that the differences of the two Natures in Christ were not destroyed by the Union; but that their Properties were preserved distinct and concur to one Person.* And against these, the other Fathers disputed just as St. *Chrysostom* had done before against the *Apollinarists.*

Concil. Chalced. Act. 5.

Theodoret brings the same Instance, and he affirms expresly, *That the Nature of the Elements is not changed, that they do not lose their proper Nature, but remain in their former Substance, Figure and Form, and may be seen and touched as before.*

Still this is not to prove any *Accidental Qualities*, but the very *Substance* of Christ's Body to remain.

Ὁ γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα σῖτον καὶ ἄρτον προσαγορεύσας, καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν ἄμπελον ὀνομάσας, οὗτος τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθηκώς. Dial. 1.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν Ἁγιαμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως, μένει γὰρ ὅπερ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἐστι καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷον καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Dial. 2.

P. But was not *Theodoret* a Man of suspected Faith in the Church? and therefore no great matter can be made of his Testimony.

Pr. Yield it then to us; and see if we do not clear *Theodoret*; but your own learned Men never question him, as to this matter (at least) and the ancient Church hath vindicated his Reputation. And he saith no more than St. *Chrysostom* before him, and others of great Esteem after him.

P. Who were they?

Pr.

Pr. What ſay you to a *Pope*, whom you account *Head of the Church?* Pope *Gelaſius* writing againſt the ſame *Hereticks*, produces the ſame Example; and he expreſly ſaith, *The Subſtance of the Bread and Wine doth not ceaſe.*

Certè Sacramenta quæ ſumimus Corporis & Sanguinis Domini divina res eſt, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur conſortes Naturæ, & tamen eſſe non deſinit ſubſtantia vel natura Panis & Vini. *Gelaſ. in Biblioth. Patr. To.* 4.

P. I thought I ſhould find you tripping. Here you put a Fob-head of the Church upon us. For the Author of the ſingle Sheet ſaith, *this was another* Gelaſius, *as is prov'd at large by* Bellarmin.

Pag. 20.

Pr. In truth, I am aſhamed of the Ignorance of ſuch ſmall Authors, who will be medling with things they underſtand not. For this Writer, ſince *Bellarmin's* time, hath been evidently proved from Teſtimonies of Antiquity, ſuch as *Fulgentius* and *John* the ſecond, to have been Pope *Gelaſius*, and that by ſome of the moſt learned Perſons of the *Roman* Communion, ſuch as Cardinal *Du Perron*, *Petavius*, *Sirmondus*, and others.

P. Have you any more that talk at this rate?

Pr. Yes. What think you of a *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, who uſeth the ſame Similitude for the ſame purpoſe; and he affirms, that the ſenſible Subſtance ſtill continues in the Euchariſt, tho it hath Divine Grace joyned with it? And I pray, now tell me ſeriouſly, did the *Tradition of Tranſubſtantiation lie unqueſtion'd and quiet all this while?* when we have three Patriarchs, of *Conſtantinople*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*, expreſly againſt it; and one of them owned by your Selves, to be Head of the Church; and held by many to be Infallible, eſpecially when he teaches the Church; which he doth, if ever, when he declares againſt Hereticks.

Οὕτω καὶ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος. Ephræm. Antioch. ap. Phot. Cod. 229.

P. I know not what to ſay, unleſs by *Nature and Subſtance* they meant *Qualities and Properties.*

Pr. I have evidently proved that could not be their meaning.

P.

P. But I am told Monſieur *Arnaud* in his elaborate Defence againſt *Claude* goes that way, and he ſaith, *The Eutychians and Apollinariſts did not abſolutely deny any Subſtance to remain in Chriſt's Body, but not ſo as to be endued with ſuch Properties as ours have.* Tom. 3. l. 5. c. 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11.

Pr. I grant this is the main of his Defence; but I confeſs, Monſieur *Arnaud* hath not ſo much Authority with me, as a *General Council* which declared the contrary; *viz. That the Eutychians were condemned for not holding two Subſtances or Natures in Chriſt after the Union.* And *Domnus Antiochenus*, who firſt laid open the *Eutychian* Hereſie, ſaith, *It lay in making a mixture and confuſion of both Natures in Chriſt, and ſo making the Divinity paſſible*; and to the ſame purpoſe others. There were ſome who charged both *Apollinaris* and *Eutyches* with holding, *that Chriſt brought his Body from Heaven, and that it was not conſubſtantial with ours*; but *Apollinaris* himſelf, in the *Fragments* preſerved by *Leontius*, not only denies it, but *pronounces an Anathema againſt thoſe that hold it.* And *Vitalis* of *Antioch*, a great Diſciple of his, in diſcourſe with *Epiphanius*, utterly denied *a Cæleſtial Body in Chriſt.* *Vincentius Lerinenſis* ſaith, *his Hereſie lay in denying two diſtinct Subſtances in Chriſt.* St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *he held but one Subſtance after the Union*; ſo that he muſt deny any *Subſtance* of a Body to remain after the Union, which he aſſerted to be wholly ſwallowed up, and the Properties to continue: Which was another kind of *Tranſubſtantiation*; for no more of the *Subſtance of Chriſt's Body* was ſuppoſed to remain after the Union, than there is ſuppoſed to be in the Elements after Conſecration. But in both Caſes the *Properties and Qualities* were the ſame ſtill. And it is obſervable, that in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Eutyches* rejected it, *as a Calumny caſt upon him, that he ſhould hold that Chriſt brought a Body from Heaven.* But the *Eutychian* Doctrine lay in taking away the *Subſtance* of the Body, and making the

Ap. Facund. l. 8. c. 5.

Ap. Canif. Antiq. Lection. To. 4. p. 112, 114, 127.

Epiph. hær. 77. Vincent. Common. Aug. de Hæreſ. c. 35.

Concil. Chalced. Act. 1.

the *Divinity* the *ſole Subſtance*, but with the *Accidents* and *Properties* of the Body. And for this they produced the Words of Saint *John*, *The Word was made Fleſh*; which they urged with the ſame Confidence that you now do, *This is my Body*. And when they were urged with Difficulties, they made the very ſame recourſe to *God's Omnipotency*, and *the Letter of Scripture*, and made the ſame Declamations againſt the *uſe of Reaſon* that you do; and withal, they would not have the Human Nature to be annihilated, but to be changed into the Divine; juſt as your Authors do about the *Subſtance* of the Bread. So that it is hard to imagin a more exact Parallel to *Tranſubſtantiation* than there is in this Doctrine; and conſequently there can be no more evident Proof of it, than the Fathers making uſe of the Inſtance of the *Euchariſt*, to ſhew, that as the *Subſtance* of Bread doth remain after *Conſecration*; ſo the Subſtance of *Chriſt's Body* doth continue after the Union. And when the Fathers from the remaining *Properties* do prove the *Subſtance* to remain, they overthrow the poſſibility of *Tranſubſtantiation*. For, if they might be without the Subſtance, their whole Argument loſes its force, and proves juſt nothing.

Theodor. Dial. 1. & 2.

P. But all this proves nothing as to the *Faith* of the *Church*; being only Arguments uſed by *Divines* in the heat of *Diſputes*.

Pr. Do you then in earneſt give up the Fathers as *Diſputants* to us; but retain them as *Believers* to your ſelves? But *how ſhould we know their Faith but by their Works?*

P. I perceive you have a mind to be pleaſant; but my meaning was, that in *Diſputes* Men may eaſily over-ſhoot themſelves, and uſe ineffectual Arguments.

Pr. But is it poſſible to ſuppoſe they ſhould draw Arguments from ſomething againſt the *Faith* of the *Church*. As for inſtance; Suppoſe now we are diſputing about *Tranſubſtantiation*, you ſhould bring an Argument from the

Huma

Human Nature of Christ, and ſay, That as in the Hypoſtatical Union the Subſtance is changed, and nothing but the Accidents remain; ſo it is in the Elements upon Conſecration. Do you think I ſhould not preſently deny your Example, and ſay, your very Suppoſition is *Heretical?* So no doubt would the *Eutychians* have done in caſe the Faith of the Church had then been, that the *Subſtance* of the Elements was changed after *Conſecration.* And the *Eutychians* were the moſt ſottiſh Diſputants in the World, if they had not brought the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* to prove their *Hereſy.*

P. Methinks you are very long upon this Argument; when ſhall we have done at this rate?

Pr. I take this for your beſt Anſwer; and ſo I proceed to a ſecond *Argument*, which I am ſure will not hold againſt the *Trinity*; and that is from *the natural and unſeparable Properties of Chriſt's Body*; which are utterly inconſiſtent with the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation.* And the force of the Argument in general lies in this, That the Fathers did attribute ſuch things to the Body of Chriſt, which render it uncapable of being preſent in ſuch a manner in the Sacrament as *Tranſubſtantiation* ſuppoſes. And no Men who underſtand themſelves, will aſſert that at one time, which they muſt be bound to deny at another; but they will be ſure to make an Exception or Limitation, which may reconcile both together. As if you ſhould ſay, *That the Body of Chriſt cannot be in more places than one at once, upon the Doctrine of St.* Thomas; ye would preſently add, with regard to the Sacrament, i. e. *not in regard of its natural Preſence, but in a Sacramental it may:* So, if the Fathers had an Opinion like yours as to the Body of Chriſt, they would have a Reſerve, or Exception, as to the Sacrament. But it appears by their Writings, that they attribute ſuch *Properties* in general to the *Body* of Chriſt, as overthrow any ſuch Preſence, without Exceptions or

Limitations. But that is not all: For I ſhall now prove,

1. That they do attribute *Circumſcription* to *Chriſt's Body in Heaven*, ſo as to exclude the poſſibility of its being upon Earth.

2. That they deny any ſuch thing, as *the ſupernatural Exiſtence of a Body after the manner of a Spirit.*

P. What do you mean? I am quite tired already; and now you are turning up the other Glaſs.

Pr. Since you will be dabling in theſe Controverſies, you muſt not think to eſcape ſo eaſily. I have been not a little offended at the Inſolence of ſome late *Pamphlets* upon this Argument; and now I come to *cloſe Reaſoning*, you would fain be gone.

P. I am in a little haſte at preſent; I pray come quickly to the Point.

Pr. As ſoon as you pleaſe. What think you, if a Man now ſhould bring an Argument to prove a matter of Faith from hence, *That Chriſt's Body could not be in Heaven and Earth at once*, would this argument hold good? Yet thus *Vigilius Tapſitanus* argues againſt thoſe who denied two Natures in Chriſt; for, ſaith he, *The Body of Chriſt when it was on Earth, was not in Heaven; and now it is in Heaven, it is not upon Earth; and it is ſo far from being ſo, that we expect him to come from Heaven in his Fleſh, whom we believe to be now preſent on Earth by his Divinity.* How can this hold, if the Body of Chriſt can be in Heaven and Earth at the ſame time?

Nam quando in Terra fuit, non erat ubiq; in Cœlo. Et nunc quia in Cœlo eſt, non eſt ubiq; in Terra, & in tantum non eſt, ut ſecundum ipſam (Carnem) Chriſtum ſpectemus eſſe venturum de Cœlo: quem ſecundum verbum nobiſcum eſſe credimus in terra. *Cont. Eutych. l. 4. n. 14.*

P. He ſpeaks this of the *Natural Preſence* of Chriſt's Body, and not of *the Sacramental.*

Pr. The Argument is not drawn from the *manner* of the *Preſence*, but from the *Nature* of a *Body*, that it could not be in Heaven and Earth at the ſame time. And ſo

St. *Auguſtin* ſaid, *That Chriſt was every where preſent as God; but confined to a certain place in Heaven according to the Meaſure of his true Body.*

Et ubique totum præſentem eſſe non dubites tanquam Deum——& in loco aliquo Cœli propter veri Corporis modum. Ad Dardan.

P. This is only to diſprove the *Ubiquity* of Chriſt's Body; and not his being in ſeveral places at the ſame time.

Pr. Then you yield it to be repugnant to the *Nature* of a *Body* to be *every where preſent.*

P. Yes.

Pr. But what if there be as great a repugnancy from St. *Auguſtin*'s Argument, for a *Body to be preſent in ſeveral places at once?*

P. I ſee no ſuch thing.

Pr. No? His Argument is from the *Confinement* of a true Body to a certain place. And if it be *in many places at once*, it is as far from being *confined*, as if it took up all places. And there are ſome greater Difficulties as to a Body's being *diſtant from it ſelf*, than in aſſerting its *Ubiquity.*

P. I perceive you are inclined to be a *Lutheran.*

Pr. No ſuch matter. For I think the Eſſential Properties of a Finite and Infinite Being are incommunicable to each other, and I look on *Ubiquity* as one of them.

P. Then the ſame Argument will not hold as to *Preſence in ſeveral places*, for this is no *Infinite Perfection.*

Pr. You run from one Argument to another. For theſe are two diſtinct ways of arguing; and the Argument from the *Repugnancy* of it to the Nature of a Body, doth as well hold againſt *Ubiquity*, as that it is a *Divine Perfection.* And St. *Auguſtin* in that excellent Epiſtle doth argue from the *Eſſential Properties* and *Dimenſions* of Bodies, and the difference of the *Preſence* of a *Spirit*, and *a Body.* I pray read and conſider that Epiſtle, and you will think it impoſſible St. *Auguſtin* ſhould believe *Tranſubſtantiation.*

P. St. *Auguſtin* was a great Diſputant, and ſuch are wont while they are eager upon one Point, to forget another. But St. *Auguſtin* elſewhere doth aſſert the *Preſence of Chriſt's real Body* in the *Sacrament.*

Pr. Then the plain Conſequence is, that he contradicted himſelf.

P. But he doth not ſpeak of a *Sacramental Preſence.*

Pr. What again? But St. *Auguſtin* makes this an eſſential difference between a *Divine and Corporal Preſence*; that *the one doth not fill places by its Dimenſions as the other doth*; ſo that Bodies cannot be in diſtant places at once. What think you of this?

Non enim Corpora ſunt quorum amplior ſit in tribus quam in ſingulis magnitudo, nec loca ſuis molibus tenent, ut diſtantibus ſpatiis ſimul eſſe non poſſint. Ad Dardan.

P. I pray go on.

Pr. What think you of the *Manichees* Doctrine, who held *that Chriſt was in the Sun and Moon when he ſuffered on the Croſs?* Was this poſſible or not?

P. What would you draw from hence?

Pr. Nothing more, but that St. *Auguſtin* diſproved it, *becauſe his Body could not be at the ſame time in the Sun and Moon, and upon Earth?*

Secundum præſentiam verò coporalem ſimul & in Sole & in Luna & in Cruce eſſe non poſſet. C. *Fauſt.* l. 20. c. 11.

P. As to the *ordinary courſe of Nature*, St. *Auguſtin's* Argument holds, but not as to the *Miraculous Power of God.*

Pr. There is a difference between the *ordinary Courſe of Nature*, and the *unchangeable Order of Nature.*

P. Let me hear this again; for it is new Doctrine to us.

Pr. That's ſtrange! Thoſe things are by the *ordinary Courſe of Nature*, which cannot be changed but by Divine Power; but imply no Repugnancy for God to alter that Courſe; but thoſe are by the *unchangeable Order of Nature*,

Nature, which cannot be done without overthrowing the very Nature of the things; and ſuch things are impoſſible in themſelves, and therefore God himſelf cannot do them.

P. It ſeems then you ſet Bounds to *God's Omnipotency.*

Pr. Doth not the *Scripture* ſay, *there are ſome things impoſſible for God to do?*

P. Yes; ſuch as are repugnant to *his own Perfections*; as *it is impoſſible for God to lye.*

Pr. But are there no other things impoſſible to be done? What think you of making the time paſt not to be paſt?

P. That is impoſſible in it ſelf.

Pr. But is it not impoſſible for the ſame Body to be in two different times?

P. Yes.

Pr. Why not then in two or more different Places; ſince a Body is as certainly confined, as to Place, as it is to Time?

P. You are run now into the Point of Reaſon, when we were upon St. *Auguſtin*'s Teſtimony.

Pr. But I ſay, St. *Auguſtin* went upon this ground, that it was repugnant to the *Nature* of a Body to be in more places than one at the ſame time. And ſo likewiſe *Caſſian* proves, *That when Chriſt was upon Earth he could not be in Heaven, but in regard of his Divinity.* Is there not the ſame Repugnancy for *a Body in*

Et cum in Terra loquitur in Cœlo utiq; niſi per Dei Infinitatem eſſe non poſſit. *De Incarn. l.* 4. *c.* 6.

Heaven

Heaven to be upon Earth, as for *a Body upon Earth to be in Heaven?*

P. Theſe are new Queſtions, which I have not met with in our Writers, and therefore I ſhall take time to anſwer them. But all theſe Teſtimonies proceed upon a Body conſidered under the *Nature of a Body*; but in the Sacrament we conſider *Chriſt's Body as preſent after the manner of a Spirit.*

Pr. That was the next thing I promiſed to prove from the *Fathers*, that they knew of no ſuch thing, and therefore could not believe your Doctrine. Have you obſerved what the *Fathers* ſay about the difference of *Body and Spirit?*

P. Not I; but I have read our Authors, who produce them for our Doctrine.

Pr. That is the perpetual fault of your Writers, to attend more to the *ſound* of their *Words*, than to the *force* of their *Reaſonings*. They bring places out of *Popular Diſcourſes* intended to heighten the Peoples Devotion, and never compare them with thoſe *Principles* which they aſſert, when they come to Reaſoning; which would plainly ſhew their other Expreſſions are to be underſtood in a *Myſtical* and *Figurative Senſe*. But I pray tell me, do you think the *Fathers* had no diſtinct Notion of a *Body* and *Spirit*, and the Eſſential *Properties* of both?

P. Yes doubtleſs.

Pr. Suppoſe then they made thoſe to lye in ſuch things as are inconſiſtent with *the Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament after the manner of a Spirit*; do you think ther-

then they could hold it to be ſo preſent? And if they did not, they could not believe *Tranſubſtantiation.*

P. Very true.

Pr. What think you then of St. *Auguſtin*, who makes it impoſſible for a Body to be without its Dimenſions and Extenſion of Parts? But you aſſert a Body may be without them; or elſe it cannot be after *the manner of a Spirit*, as you ſay it is in the Sacrament.

P. I pray ſhew that St. *Auguſtin* made it inconſiſtent with the Nature of a Body to be otherwiſe.

Pr. He ſaith, *That all Bodies how groſs or ſubtle ſoever they be, can never be all every where* (*i. e.* cannot be indiviſibly preſent after the manner of a Spirit) *but muſt be extended according to their ſeveral Parts, and whether great or little, muſt take up a ſpace, and ſo fill the Place, that it cannot be all in any one Part.* Is this poſſible to be reconciled with your Notion of a *Body* being preſent after *the manner of a Spirit?*

Sive iſta craſſiora, ſive ſubtiliora, ſed tamen Corpora, quorum nullum poteſt eſſe ubique totum, quoniam per innumerabiles partes aliud alibi habeat neceſſe eſt. Et quantumcunq; ſit Corpus, ſeu quantulumcunque corpuſculum, loci occupet ſpatium, eundemque locum ſic impleat, ut in nullâ ejus parte ſit totum. Ad Voluſian.

P. To be preſent after the manner of a Spirit, is with us, to be ſo preſent, as *not to be extended*, and to *be whole in every part.*

Pr. But this St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *no Body can be*; and not only there, but elſewhere he ſaith, *Take away Dimenſions from Bodies, and they are no longer Bodies. And*

Quanquam si hoc demas Corporibus, quantum mea opinio est, neq; sentiri possunt, neque omnino Corpora esse rectè existimarem. De Quant. Animæ, c. 4.

that a greater part takes up a greater space, and a lesser a less; and must be always less in the part than in the whole.

Quod per loci spatium aliqua longitudine, latitudine, altitudine ita sistitur vel movetur, ut majore sui parte majorem locum occupet, & breviore breviorem, minusq; sit in parte quam in toto. Ad Hieron. Ep. 166.

P. But he speaks of *Extension in it self*, and not with respect to *Place*.

Pr. That is of *Extension* that is *not extended*; for if it be, it must have respect *to Place*; but nothing can be plainer, than that St. *Augustin* doth speak *with respect to Place*. And he elsewhere saith, *That every Body must have Place, and be extended in it.*

Non omnino potest esse aliquod Corpus, sive Cœleste, sive Terrestre, sive Aereum, sive humidum, quod non minus sit in parte quam in toto, neque ullo modo possit in loco hujus partis simul habere aliam partem, sed aliud hic, aliud alibi habens per quælibet spatia locorum distantia & dividua, vel potius ut ita dicam, sectili more distenditur. C. Epist. Manich. c. 16.

Omne Corpus locale est, & omne locale Corpus est. 63. Quæst. c. 35.

Corpus quodlibet per localia spatia porrectum est. 83. Quæst. c. 51.

P. But he doth not speak this of the *Sacrament*.

Pr. But he speaks it of all *Bodies whereſoever present*; and he doth not except *the Sacrament*, which he would certainly have done, if he had believed as you do concerning it.

P. St. *Augustin* might have particular Opinions in this, as he had in other things.

Pr.

Pr. So far from it, that I ſhall make it appear, that this was the general *Senſe* of the *Fathers*. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* ſaith, *That the Nature of Bodies requires, that they have Figure and Shape, and may be touched, and ſeen, and circumſcribed.* St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* ſaith, *That if God himſelf were a Body, he muſt be liable to the Properties of Bodies, and he muſt be in a place, as Bodies are.* And all thoſe Fathers, who prove, that *God* cannot be a *Body*, do it from ſuch Arguments as ſhew, that they knew nothing of a *Bodies* Being after *the manner of a Spirit:* For then the force of their Arguments is loſt, which are taken from the *Eſſential Properties* of a Body, ſuch as *Extenſion*, *Diviſibility*, and *Circumſcription.* But if a Body may be without theſe, then God may be *a Body after the manner of a Spirit*; and ſo the *Spirituality* of the *Divine Nature* will be taken away.

Orat. 34. & in Ep. ad Cledon. Dial. 2. de Trin.

P. I never heard theſe Arguments before, and muſt take ſome time to conſider.

Pr. The ſooner the better; and I am ſure if you do, you will repent being a *New Convert.* But I have yet ſomething to add to this Argument; *viz.* That thoſe who have ſtated the Difference between *Body* and *Spirit*, have made *Extenſion, and taking up a place, and Diviſibility, neceſſary to the very Being of a Body*; and *that what is not circumſcribed, is incorporeal.*

Claud. Mamert. de Statu Animæ, l. 1. c. 3, 17, 18. l. 3. c. 14.

P. Methinks your Arguments run out to a great length. I pray bring them into a leſs Compaſs.

Pr. I proceed to a Third Argument from the *Fathers*, which will not take up much time; and that is, That the Fathers knew nothing of the *Subſiſtence of Accidents without their Subſtance*, without which *Tranſubſtantiation* cannot be maintained: And therefore in the *Roman Schools*, the *poſſibility* of *Accidents* ſubſiſting without their *Subjects*, is defended. But on the contrary, *Maximus*, one of the eldeſt of the Fathers, who lived in the Second Century, affirms it *to be of the Eſſence of Accidents to be in their Subſtance.*

Apud Euſeb. de Præp. Evangel. l. 7. c. 22.

Basil. Epist. 43. St. *Basil* saith, *Nature doth not bear a distinction between Body and Figure, altho Reason makes one.*

Isidor. Epist. l. 2. Ep. 72. *Isidore Peluſiota*, saith, *That Quality cannot be without Substance.*

Greg. Nyssen. in Hexaem. p. 13 De Hom. Opificio. c. 24. *Gregory Nyſſen*, That *Figure cannot be without Body, and that a Body cannot be conceived without Qualities: And that if we take away Colour, and Quantity, and Reſiſtance, the whole Notion of a Body is deſtroy'd. Take away Space from Bodies*, saith St. *Auguſtin, and they can be no where; and if they can be no where, they cannot be:* And ſo he ſaith, *if we take away Bodies from their Qualities.* And in plain terms, *That no Qualities, as Colours, or Form, can remain without their Subject.*

Aug. Ep. ad Dardanum. cont. Julian. l. 5. c. 9.

Isid. Origin. l. 2. c. 26. Boeth. de Prædic. Damasc. Damasc. Dial. c. 1. Alcuin. Dial. c. 5, 12. And *that no Accidents can be without their Subject*, is in general affirmed by *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis*, *Boethius*, *Damaſcen*, and others, who give an Account of the Philoſophy of the Ancients.

P. All this proceeds upon the *old Philoſophy* of *Accidents*: What if there be none at all?

Pr. What then makes the *ſame Impreſſion* on our Senſes when the *Subſtance* is gone, as when it was there? Is there a perpetual Miracle to deceive our Senſes? But it is impoſſible to maintain *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it is defined in the Church of *Rome*, without *Accidents*: They may hold ſome other Doctrine in the place of it, but they cannot hold that. And that other Doctrine will be as impoſſible to be underſtood. For if once we ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt to be in the Sacrament, in place of the *Subſtance of the Bread*, which appears to our Senſes to be Bread ſtill: Then ſuppoſe there be *no Accidents*, the *Body* of a *Man* muſt make the ſame Impreſſion on our *Senſes*, which the *Subſtance* of Bread doth, which is ſo horrible an Abſurdity, that the *Philoſophy* of *Accidents* cannot imply any greater than it. So that the New *Tranſubſtantiators* had as good return to the Old *Mumpſimus* of *Accidents*.

P. I ſuppoſe you have now done with this Argument.

Pr. No: I have ſomething farther to ſay about it, which is, that the Fathers do not only aſſert, *That Accidents cannot be without their Subject*, but they confute *Hereticks* on that Suppoſition; which ſhew'd their aſſurance of the Truth of it.

Irenæus overthrows the *Valentinian Conjugations*, *becauſe Truth can no more be without a Subject, than Water without Moiſture, or Fire without Heat, or a Stone without Hardneſs; which are ſo joined together, that they cannot be ſeparated.* Iren. l. 2. c. 14.

Methodius confutes *Origen's* Fancy about the Soul having the Shape of a Body without the Subſtance, *becauſe the Shape and the Body cannot be ſeparated from each other.* Apud. Phot. Cod. 234.

St. *Auguſtin* proves the *Immortality* of the *Soul* from hence, *becauſe meer Accidents can never be ſeparated from the Body, ſo as the mind is by abſtraction.* And in another place he aſſerts it to be a *monſtrous abſurd Doctrine, to ſuppoſe that, whoſe Nature is to be in a Subject, to be capable of ſubſiſting without it.* Aug. de Immort. Anim. c. 10. Soliloq. l. 2. c. 13.

Claudianus Mamertus proves, *That the Soul could not be in the Body as its Subject; for then it could not ſubſiſt when the Body is deſtroy'd.* De Statu Animo. l. 3. c. 3.

P. I hope you have now done with this Third Argument.

Pr. Yes; and I ſhall wait your own time for an Anſwer. I go on to a Fourth: And that is from *the Evidence of Senſe* aſſerted and allowed by *the Fathers*, with reſpect to the Body of Chriſt.

P. I expected this before now. For, as the Author of the *Single Sheet* obſerves: *This is the Cock-Argument of one of the Lights of your Church; and it ſo far reſembles the Light, that like it, it makes a glaring ſhew, but go to graſp it, and you find nothing in your hand.*

Pr. Then it's plain our Senſes are deceived.

P. Not as to *Tranſubſtantiation:* for *he believes more of his Senſes than we do: for his Eyes tell him there is the Colour of Bread, and he aſſents to them; his Tongue, that it has the Taſte of Bread, and he agrees to it: and ſo for his Smelling and Feeling:* But then he hath a notable ſetch in his Concluſion: viz. *That his Ears tell him from the Words ſpoken by Chriſt himſelf, that it is the Body of Chriſt, and he believes theſe too. Is not here one Senſe more than you believe? And yet you would perſuade the World, that we do not believe our Senſes.*

Pr. This is admirable Stuff; but it muſt be tenderly dealt with. For I pray what doth he mean when he ſaith, *he believes from Chriſt's own Words, that it is the Body of Chriſt?* What is this *It?* Is it the *Accidents* he ſpeaks of before? Are thoſe *Accidents* then *the Body of Chriſt?* Is it the *Subſtance of Bread?* But *that is not diſcerned by the Senſes,* he ſaith: and if it were, will he ſay, that the Subſtance of Bread is the Body of Chriſt? If neither of theſe, then his believing *It is the Body of Chriſt*, ſignifies nothing; for there can be no ſenſe of *it.*

P. However, he ſhews, *That we who believe Tranſubſtantiation, do not renounce our Senſes, as you commonly reproach us:* For we believe all that our Senſes repreſent to us, which is only the outward appearance. For, as he well obſerves, *If your Eyes ſee the Subſtance of things, they are moſt extraordinary ones, and better than ours. For our parts, we ſee no farther than the Colour or Figure, &c. of things which are only Accidents, and the entire Object of that Senſe.*

Pr. Is there no difference between the *Perception* of *Senſe*, and the *Evidence* of *Senſe?* We grant, that the *Perception* of our Senſes goes no farther than to the *outward Accidents*; but that *Perception* affords ſuch an *Evidence* by which the Mind doth paſs Judgment upon the thing repreſented by the outward Senſe. I pray tell me, have you any *certainty* there

is

is such a thing as a *material Substance* in the World?

P. Yes.

Pr. Whence comes the certainty of the *Substance*, since your Senses cannot discover it? Do we live among nothing but *Accidents*? Or can we know nothing beyond them?

P. I grant we may know in general that there are such things as *Substances* in the World.

Pr. But can we not know the difference of *one Substance* from another, by our Senses? As for instance, can we not know a Man from a Horse, or an Elephant from a Mouse, or a piece of Bread from a Church? Or do we only know there are such and such *Accidents* belong to every one of these; but our Senses are not so *extraordinary* to discover the *Substances* under them? I pray answer me one Question, Did you ever keep *Lent*?

P. What a strange Question is this? Did you not tell me, you would avoid Impertinencies?

Pr. This is none, I assure you.

P. Then I answer, I think my self obliged to keep it.

Pr. Then you thought your self bound to abstain from *Flesh*, and to eat *Fish*.

P. What of all that?

Pr. Was it the *Substance* of *Flesh* you abstained from, or only the *Accidents* of it?

P. The *Substance*?

Pr. And did you know the difference between the *Substance* of *Flesh* and *Fish* by your *Taste*?

P. Yes.

Pr. Then you have an *extraordinary Taste*, which goes to the *very Substance*?

P. But this is off from our Business, which was about the *Fathers*, and not our own *Judgment* about the *Evidence* of *Sense*.

Pr. I am ready for you upon that Argument. And I only desire to know whether you think the *Evidence of Sense* suffici-

ſufficient, as to the *true Body of Chriſt*, where it is ſuppoſed to be preſent?

P. By no means; For then we could not believe it to be preſent, where we cannot perceive it.

Pr. But the Fathers did aſſert the Evidence of Senſe to be ſufficient, as to the true Body of Chriſt; ſo *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, *Hilary*, and St. *Auguſtin*. I will produce their Words at length, if you deſire them.

Iren. l. 3. 20. 5. 7. Tertul. de Carne Chriſti, c. 5. Adverſ. Marc. l. 4. c. 43. l 3. c. 8, 11. Epiphan. hær. 42, 64. Hilar. in Pſal. 137. Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 29. c. 2. l. 14. c. 10. 83. Quæſt. c. 14. Serm. 238.

P. It will be but loſt labour, ſince we deny not, as Cardinal *Bellarmin* well ſaith, *The Evidence of Senſe to be a good poſitive Evidence, but not a negative*, i. e. that it is a Body, which is handled, and felt, and ſeen; but not, that it is no Body which is not.

De Euch. l. 1. c. 14.

Pr. Very well! And I pray then what becomes of your *ſingle Sheet man*, who ſo confidently denies *Senſe* to be good *poſitive Evidence* as to a *real Body*; but only as to the *outward appearance*?

P. You miſtake him; for he ſaith, *We are to believe our Senſes, where they are not indiſpoſed, and no Divine Revelation intervenes*, which we believe there doth in this Caſe; and therefore, unleſs the Fathers ſpeak of the Sacrament, we have no reaſon to regard their Teſtimonies in this matter. But we have ſtronger Evidence againſt you from the Fathers, for they ſay we are not to rely on the Evidence of Senſe, as to the Sacrament. So St. *Cyril*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, and St. *Ambroſe*.

Pr. I am glad you offer any thing which deſerves to be conſidered. But have you already forgot *Bellarmin*'s Rule, That *Senſe* may be a *good poſitive Evidence*, but not a *negative*, *i. e.* it may diſcover what is preſent as a Body, but not what is not, and cannot be ſo preſent, *viz.* the *Inviſible Grace* which goes along with it; and as to this the *Fathers* might well ſay, *we are not to truſt our Senſe.* *P.* This

P. This is making an Interpretation for them.

Pr. No such matter. It is the proper and genuine Sense of their Words; as will appear from hence.

(1.) They assert the very same, as to the *Chrism* and *Baptism*, which they do as to the *Eucharist*.

(2.) That which they say, our *Senses* cannot reach, is something of a *spiritual Nature*, and not a *Body*. And here the Case is extremely different from the Judgment of Sense, as to a material *Substance*. And if you please, I will evidently prove from the Fathers, that that wherein they excluded the Judgment of Sense in the Eucharist, was something wholly *Spiritual* and *Immaterial*.

Cyril. Mystag. 3, & 4, 5. Catech. 3. Chrysost. in Matt. hom 83. Ambrosde his qui initiantur, c. 9.

P. No, no, we have been long enough upon the *Fathers*, unless their Evidence were more certain one way or other. For my part, I believe on the account of Divine Revelation in this matter, *This is my Body*; here I stick, and the Fathers agreed with us herein, that Christ's words are not to be taken in a figurative Sense.

Pr. The contrary hath been so plainly proved in a late excellent Discourse of *Transubstantiation*, that I wonder none of your Party have yet undertaken to answer it; but they write on, as if no such Treatise had appear'd: I shall therefore wave all the Proofs that are there produced, till some tolerable Answer be given to them.

P. Methinks you have taken a great Liberty of talking about the *Fathers*, as tho they were all on your side; but our late Authors assure us to the contrary; and I hope I may now make use of them, to shew that *Transubstantiation* was *the Faith of the Ancient Church*.

Pr. With all my heart, I even long to hear what they can say in a matter, I think, so clear on our side.

P. Well, Sir, I begin with the *Consensus Veterum*, written by one that professed himself a *Minister* of the *Church* of *England*.

Pr.

Pr. Make what you can of him, now you have him; but I will meddle with no personal Things, I desire to hear his Arguments.

P. What say you to *R. Selomo*, interpreting the 72. Psal. v. 16. *Of Wafers in the days of the Messias*; *to* R. Moses Haddarsan, *on Gen.* 39. 1. *and on Psal.* 136. 25, *to* R. Cahana, *on Gen.* 49. 1. *who was long before the Nativity of Christ*; R. Johai, *on Numb.* 28. 2. *and to* R. Judas, *who was many years before Christ came.*

Consensus Veterum, p. 21, 22, 23.

Pr. Can you hold your Countenance when you repeat these things? But any thing must pass from a *New Convert*. What think you of *R. Cahana*, and *R. Judas*, who lived so long before our Saviour, when we know that the *Jews* have no Writings preserved near to our Saviour's time, besides the Bible, and some say the *Paraphrasts* upon it. I would have been glad to have seen these Testimonies taken from their Original Authors, and not from *Galatinus*, who is known to have been a *notorious Plagiary*, as to the main of his Book, and of little or no Credit as to the rest. But it is ridiculous to produce the Testimonies of *Jewish Rabbins* for *Transubstantiation*, when it is so well known that it is one of their greatest objections against *Christianity*, as taught in the *Roman* Church, as may be seen in *Joseph Albo*, and others. But what is all this to the Testimony of the *Christian Fathers*?

P. Will not you let a Man shew a little *Jewish Learning* upon occasion? But if you have a mind to the Fathers, you shall have enough of them; for I have a large Catalogue of them to produce, from the *Consensus Veterum*, *Nubes Testium*, and the *single Sheet*, which generally agree.

Pr. With *Coccius* or *Bellarmin*, you mean; but before you produce them, I pray tell me what you intend to prove by them?

P. The Doctrine of our Church.

Pr. As to what?

P. What

P. What have we been about all this while?

Pr. *Tranſubſtantiation.* Will you prove that?

P. Why do you ſuſpect me before I begin?

Pr. I have ſome Reaſon for it. Let us firſt agree what we mean by it. Do you mean the ſame which the Church of *Rome* doth by it, in the *Council* of *Trent*?

P. What can we mean elſe?

Pr. Let us firſt ſee what that is. The Council of *Trent* declares, *That the ſame Body of Chriſt, which is in Heaven, is really, truly and ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt after Conſecration, under the Species of Bread and Wine.* And the *Roman Catechiſm* ſaith, *It is the very Body which was born of the Virgin, and ſits at the right hand of God.* (2.) *That the Bread and Wine after Conſecration, loſe their proper Subſtances, and are changed into that very Subſtance of the Body of Chriſt.* And an *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe who affirm the contrary. Now if you pleaſe, proceed to your Proofs.

P. I begin with the *Ancient Liturgies of St.* Peter, *St.* James, *and St.* Matthew. Conſenſ. Vet. p. 27.

Pr. Are you in earneſt?

P. Why; what is the matter?

Pr. Do not you know, that theſe are rejected as *Suppoſititious*, by your own Writers? And a very late and learned Dr. of the *Sorbon*, hath given full and clear Evidences of it. *Nouvelle Biblioth. des Antiens Eccleſiaſtiques par Ellies du Pin.* 1686.

P. Suppoſe they are, *Yet they may be of Antiquity enough, to give ſome competent Teſtimony as to Tradition.*

Pr. No ſuch matter: For he proves *St.* Peter's *Liturgy*, to be later than the *Sacramentary of St.* Gregory; and ſo can prove nothing for the firſt 600 *years*; and the *Æthiopick Liturgy*, or St. *Matthew*'s, he ſhews to be very late. That of St. *James*, he thinks to have been ſome time before the Five *General Councils*; but by no means to have been St. *James*'s. P. 22. P. 23.

P. What

Consens. p. 30.

P. What think you of the *Acts of St.* Andrew, and what he saith therein, *about eating the Flesh of Christ?*

Pr. I think he saith nothing to the purpose. But I am ashamed to find one, who hath so long been a Minister in this Church, so extreamly ignorant, as to bring these for good *Authorities*, which are rejected with scorn by all Men of Learning and Ingenuity among you.

P. I am afraid you grow angry.

Pr. I confess, *Ignorance* and *Confidence* together, are very provoking things; especially, when a Man in years pretends to leave our Church on such pitiful Grounds.

P. But he doth produce better *Authorities.*

Pr. If he doth, they are not to his purpose.

P. That must be tried; What say you to *Ignatius?* I hope you allow his *Epistles?*

Pr. I see no reason to the contrary. But what saith he?

Consens. Veter p. 30. Nubes Testium, p. 109.

P. He saith, *That some Hereticks then would not receive the Eucharist and Oblations, because they will not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Christ.* And this is produced by both Authors.

Tertull. c. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40.

Pr. The Persons *Ignatius* speaks of, were such as denied Christ to have *any true Body*, and therefore did forbear the *Eucharist*, because it was said to be *his Body.* And in what ever Sense it were taken, it still supposed that which they denied, *viz.* that he had a true Body: For, if it were figuratively understood, it was as contrary to their Doctrine, as if it were literally. For a *Figure* must relate to a *real Body*, as *Tertullian* argued in this Case. And *Ignatius* in the same *Epistle*, mentions the trial Christ made of his true Body, by the Senses of his Disciples, *Take hold of me, and handle me, and see, for I am no incorporeal Dæmon; and immediately they touched him, and were convinced.* Which happen'd but a few days after Christ had said, *This is my Body*; and our Saviour gave a Rule for judging a true Body, from an appearance, or spiritual Substance; *A Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones,*

Bones, as ye ſee me have. Therefore it is very improbable that *Ignatius* ſo ſoon after, ſhould aſſert that Chriſt's true and real Body was in the Euchariſt, where it could be neither ſeen nor felt: For then he muſt overthrow the force of his former Argument. And to what purpoſe did Chriſt ſay, *That a Spirit had not Fleſh and Bones, as they ſaw him to have*; if a Body of Chriſt might be ſo much after the *manner of a Spirit*, as tho it had Fleſh and Bones, yet they could not poſſibly be diſcerned? But after all, ſuppoſe *Ignatius* doth ſpeak of the Subſtance of Chriſt's Fleſh, as preſent in the *Euchariſt*; yet he ſaith not a word of the *changing of the Subſtance* of the Bread into the *Subſtance of Chriſt's Body*; which was the thing to be proved.

P. But *Juſtin Martyr* doth ſpeak of the change, and his Words are produced by all three. And they are thus rendred in the ſingle Sheet. *For we do not receive this as common Bread, or common Drink, but as by the Word of God, Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer being made Man, had both Fleſh and Blood for our Salvation; ſo alſo, we are taught that this Food, by which our Blood and Fleſh are by a change nouriſhed, being conſecrated by the Power of the Word, is the Fleſh and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt incarnate:* What ſay you to this? Apol. 2.

Pr. I deſire you to conſider theſe things. (1.) That *Juſtin Martyr* doth not ſay, That the Bread and Wine are by Conſecration changed into the *Individual Fleſh and Blood, in which Chriſt was Incarnate*; but that, *as by the Power of the Word, Chriſt once had a Body in the Womb of the Virgin; ſo by the Power of the ſame Word, upon Conſecration, the Bread and Wine do become the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt Incarnate*; ſo that he muſt mean a *parallel*, and not the *ſame Individual Body*, i. e. that as the *Body* in the *Womb* became the *Body of Chriſt* by the *Power of the Holy Spirit*; ſo the *Holy Spirit* after Conſecration, makes the Elements

to become the Flesh and Blood of Christ, not by an *Hypostatical Union*, but by *Divine Influence*, as *the Church is the Body of Christ*. And this was the true Notion of the Ancient Church, as to this matter, and the expressions in the *Greek Liturgies* to this day confirm the same. (2.) He doth not in the least imply that the *Elements* by this change do lose their *Substance*; for he mentions *the nourishment of our Bodies by it*; but he affirms, that notwithstanding their Substance remain, yet the *Divine Spirit of Christ*, *by its Operation*, *doth make them become his Body*. For we must observe, that he attributes *the Body in the Womb*, and *on the Altar*, to the same λόγος, or *Divine Word*. For he did not think *Hypostatical Union* necessary, to make the Elements become *the Body of Christ*, but a *Divine Energy* was sufficient, as the *Bodies* assumed by *Angels* are their *Bodies*, tho there be no such *vital Union*, as there is between the *Soul* and *Body of a Man*.

P. 31. Iren. l. 4. c. 34. *P.* I go on to *Irenæus*, from whom two places are produced, one by the *Consensus Veterum*, where he saith, *That which is Bread from the Earth, perceiving the call of God, now is not common Bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, one Earthly, and the other Spiritual.*

Pr. Very well! Then there is an *Earthly*, as well as a *Spiritual thing* in the *Eucharist*, i. e. a *Bodily Substance*, and *Divine Grace*.

P. No; he saith, *The Earthly is the Accidents.*

Pr. Doth *Irenæus* say so?

P. No; but he means so.

Pr. There is not a word to that purpose in *Irenæus*; and therefore this is downright Prevarication. I grant *Irenæus* doth suppose a *change* made by *Divine Grace*; but not by *destroying the Elements*, but by *super-adding Divine Grace* to them; and so the *Bread* becomes the *Body of Christ*, and the *Wine his Blood.*

P. The

P. The other place in *Irenæus* is, where he saith, *That as the Bread receiving the Word of God, is made the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ, so also our Bodies being nourished by it, and laid in the Earth, and there dissolved, will arise at their time*, &c. Iren. l. 5. c. 11.

Pr. What do you prove from this place?

P. That *the same Divine Power is seen in making the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, which is to be in the Resurrection of the Body.*

Pr. But doth this prove, that *the Substance* of the *Bread* is changed into *the Substance of Christ's Body?*

P. Why not?

Pr. I will give you a plain Argument against it; for he saith, *Our Bodies are nourished by the Body and Blood of Christ.* Do you think that *Irenæus* believed the *substance of Christ's Body* was turned into the *substance of our Bodies*, in order to their nourishment? No; he explained himself just before in the same place; *De Calice qui est Sanguis ejus, nutritur; & de pane qui est Corpus ejus; augetur:* So that he attributes *the nourishment* to *the Bread and Wine*; and therefore must suppose *the substance* of them to remain, since it is impossible a *substantial nourishment* should be made by meer *Accidents.* And withal, observe, he saith expressly, *That the Bread* is *the Body of Christ*; which your best Writers (such as *Bellarmin, Suarez* and *Vasquez*) say, *is inconsistent with Transubstantiation.*

P. My next Author is *Tertullian*, who is produced by the *Consensus Veterum*, and the *Single Sheet*, but omitted by the *Nubes Testium*; but the other proves, *That Bread which was the Figure of Christ's Body in the Old Testament, now in the New, is changed into the real and true Body of Christ.*

Pr. This is a bold Attempt upon *Tertullian*, to prove, that by *the Figure of Christ's Body*, he means his *true and real Body.* For his Words are, *Acceptum panem & distribu-* Con. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40.

tum

tum Discipulis Corpus illum suum fecit, Hoc est Corpus meum dicendo, id est, Figura Corporis mei. He took the bread, and gave it to his Disciples, and made it his Body, saying, This is my Body; i.e. *this is the Figure of my Body.* How can those men want Proofs, that can draw *Transubstantiation* from these Words, which are so plain against it?

P. You are mistaken; *Tertullian* by *Figure* meant, *it was a Figure in the Old Testament*, but it was now *his real Body.*

Pr. You put very odd *Figures* upon *Tertullian*: I appeal to any reasonable man, whether by the latter words he doth not explain the former? For he puts the Sense upon *Corpus meum*, by adding *dicendo* to them; *i. e. This is the meaning of that Speech*, when he calleth *the Bread his Body.*

P. Doth not *Tertullian* say, *That it had not been the Figure, unless it had been the Truth?*

Pr. This is again perverting his words, which are, *Figuratum non fuisset nisi veritatis esset Corpus*; *i.e.* there had been no place for *a Figure of Christ's Body, unless Christ had a true body.* For he was proving against *Marcion*, that *Christ had a true Body*; and among other Arguments he produces this from *the Figure of his Body*, which he not only mentions here, but in other places; where he saith, *That Christ gave the Figure of his Body to the Bread*; which cannot relate to any *Figure* of the *Old Testament.*

Con. Marcion. l. 3. c. 19. l. 5. c. 8.

P. But doth not *Tertullian* say afterwards, *That the Bread was the figure of Christ's body in the Old Testament?*

Pr. What then? He had Two Designs against *Marcion*; one to prove, *that Christ had a true body*, which he doth here from the *figure of his body*: and the other, *that there was a Correspondency of both Testaments*: and for that purpose he shews, that the *bread in* Jeremiah, *was the figure of Christ's body.*

P. But the Author of the *Single Sheet*, cites another place of *Tertullian*, where he saith, *that our flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that our soul may be filled with God.*

De Resur. c. 8.

Pr.

Pr. By the *body and blood of Chriſt*, he means there, *the Elements, with Divine Grace* going along with them; as appears by his deſign, which is, to ſhew how *the body and ſoul are joyned together in Sacramental Rites. The fleſh is waſhed, and the ſoul is cleanſed; the fleſh is anointed, and the ſoul conſecrated; the fleſh is ſigned, and the ſoul confirmed; the fleſh hath hands laid upon it, and the ſoul enlighten'd; the fleſh feeds on the body and blood of Chriſt, that the ſoul may be filled with God.* Now unleſs *Tertullian* meant the Elements, the Parallel doth not proceed; for all the reſt are ſpoken of the *external Symbols*; and ſo this doth not at all contradict what he ſaith elſewhere, no more than the Paſſage in the ſecond Book *ad Uxorem* doth. For there he ſpeaks of *Chriſt, with reſpect to the inviſible Grace*, as he doth here, as to the *outward Symbols*.

P. Clemens Alexandrinus ſaith, *That* Melchiſedeck *gave Bread and Wine in figure of the Euchariſt.* Strom. 4.

Pr. And what then? What is this to *Tranſubſtantiation?*

P. Origen ſaith, *When you eat and drink the body and blood of our Lord, then our Lord enters under your roof, &c.* Hom. 3. in diverſ. loc.

Pr. Are you ſure that *Origen* ſaid this? But ſuppoſe he did, muſt he enter with *his fleſh and bones*, and not much rather by a *peculiar preſence of his Grace?* For is it not *Origen* who ſo carefully diſtinguiſhes the *Typical* and *Symbolical body of Chriſt*, from the Divine Word, and ſo expreſly mentions the *material part of the Elements after Conſecration, which paſs into the Draught, &c.* Is all this meant of the *Accidents* only? Comment. in Matth. 15.

P. What ſay you to St. *Cyprian de Cœna Domini?*

Pr. I beg your pardon, Sir; this is now known and acknowledged to be a late Author, in compariſon, and cannot come within your 600 years; and therefore is not ancient enough to be conſidered.

P. But

Cypr. de lapſis. *P.* But in his genuine Writings he ſpeaks of *thoſe who offer'd Violence to the body and blood of our Lord in the Euchariſt.*

Pr. And I pray what follows? That *the ſubſtance* of the *Elements* is gone: Where lies the Conſequence? But St. *Cyprian* ſaith, *the bread was his body, and the wine his blood*; therefore their *ſubſtance* muſt remain.

Epiſt. 63. N. 6.

P. What ſay you to *Euſebius Emeſenus*?

Pr. That he is not within our compaſs; and withal, that he is a known Counterfeit.

P. I perceive you are hard to pleaſe.

Pr. You ſay very true, as to *ſuppoſititious Writers.*

P. I hope you have more Reverence for the *Council of Nice.*

Pr. But where doth that ſpeak of *Tranſubſtantiation?*

P. It calls the *Euchariſt the body of Chriſt.*

Pr. And ſo doth the *Church of England*; therefore that holds *Tranſubſtantiation.* I pray bring no more ſuch Teſtimonies, which prove nothing but what we hold.

P. I perceive you have a mind to cut me ſhort.

Pr. Not in the leaſt, where you offer any thing to the purpoſe. But I pray ſpare thoſe who only affirm, that the *Euchariſt is the body and blood of Chriſt after Conſecration.* For I acknowledg it was the Language of the Church, eſpecially in the fourth Century, when the *Names* of the *Elements* were hardly mention'd to the *Catechumens*; and all the Diſcourſes of the Fathers to them, tended to heighten the Devotion and Eſteem of the Euchariſt. By which Obſervation you may eaſily underſtand the meaning of the Eloquent Writers of that Age, who ſpeak with ſo much *Myſtery and Obſcurity* about it. If you have any that go beyond lofty expreſſions, and Rhetorical flights, I pray produce them.

P. I perceive you are afraid of *S. Greg. Nazianzen*, and *S. Baſil*, but eſpecially *S. Chryſoſtom*, you fence ſo much beforehand againſt Eloquent Men.

Pr. As

Pr. As to the other two, there is nothing material alledged by any to this purpose; but S. *Chrysostom*, I confess, doth speak very lofty things concerning the *Sacrament* in his popular Discourses, but yet nothing that doth prove *Transubstantiation.*

P. What think you of his *Homilies*, 51 *and* 83. *on S.* Mat. 46. *Homily on S.* John 24. *Homily on* 1st *to the* Corinth. *the Homilies on* Philogonius *and the Cross?* Are there not strange things in them concerning the Eucharist? *About eating Christ, and seeing him lie before them slain on the Altar; about touching his Body there, and the Holy Spirit, with an innumerable Host, hovering over what is there proposed,* with much more to that purpose. Nubes Testium p. 120. &c. Consens. Vet. p. 54, &c.

Pr. You need not to recite more; for I yield that St. *Chrysostom* delighted in the highest flights of his Eloquence, on this Subject, in his *Homilies*; and he tells for what Reason, to excite the Reverence and Devotion of the People. But yet himself doth afford us a sufficient Key to these expressions, if we attend to these things concerning his manner of speaking:

(1.) That he affirms those things which no side can allow to be literally understood. As when he so often speaks of *our seeing and touching Christ upon the Altar*, which is inconsistent with the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation: For Christ is utterly invisible on the Altar, even by Divine Power,* saith *Suarez. He is invisible in the Sacrament,* saith *Bellarmin*; and he saith also, *that he cannot be touched.* What then is to be said to such expressions of S. *Chrysostom?* Disp. 53. Sect. 4. De Euch. l. 1. c. 2.

Behold thou seest him, thou touchest him, thou eatest him. Hom. 83. in Mat.

It is not his Sacrament only which is offer'd us to touch, but himself. What if you do not hear his Voice, do you not see him lying before you? Hom. 51. in Mat.

Behold Christ lying before you slain. In Heb. Hom. 14.

Christ lies on the holy Table, as a Sacrifice slain for us. In Rom. Hom. 8.

Thou swearest upon the holy Table where Christ lies slain. Ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 15.

De Sacerd. l. 3. *When thou ſeeſt our Lord lying on the Table, and the Prieſt praying, and the by-ſtanders purpled with his Blood.*

In Joh. Hom. 45. *See the Love of Chriſt; he doth not only ſuffer himſelf to be ſeen by thoſe who deſire it, but to be touched and eaten, and our Teeth to be fixed in his Fleſh.*

Now theſe Expreſſions are on all ſides granted to be literally abſurd and impoſſible; and therefore we muſt ſay of him as *Bonaventure* once ſaid of S. *Auguſtin, Plus dicit ſanctus & minus vult intelligi*; We muſt make great allowance for ſuch Expreſſions, or you muſt hold a *Capernaitical Senſe.*

And it is denied by your ſelves, *that Chriſt is actually ſlain upon the Altar*; and therefore you yield, that ſuch Expreſſions are to be figuratively underſtood.

(2.) That he lets fall many things in ſuch Diſcourſes which do give light to the reſt: As,

Hom. in Gal. c. 5. (1.) *That Fleſh is improperly taken when applied to the Euchariſt.*

Hom. de Reſur. To. 5. (2.) He calls *the Sacrament the Myſtical Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

Hom. 46. in Joh. (3.) *That the eating of Chriſt's Fleſh is not to be underſtood literally, but ſpiritually.*

Hom. 28. in 1. Ep. ad Corinth. (4.) He oppoſes *Chriſt's ſacramental Preſence, and real corporal Preſence to each other.*

Hom. 24. in 1. ad Corinth. Hom. 22. in Hebr. (5.) He ſtill exhorts *the Communicants to look upwards towards Heaven.*

And now if you lay theſe things together, this Eloquent Father will not, with all his Flights, come near to *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Hom. de Pœnit. To. 6. *P.* No! In one place he aſſerts *the Subſtance of the Elements to be loſt.*

Pr. Thanks to the *Latin* Tranſlators, for the *Greek* word ἀναιδίζει, as the *Criticks* obſerve, doth not ſignify *to deſtroy*, but *to refine*, and purify a Subſtance. But I do not rely upon this; for the plain anſwer is, that S. *Chryſoſtom* doth not there ſpeak of the *Elements* upon *Conſecration*, but what becomes of

of them, after they are taken down into the Stomach. St. *Chryſoſtom* thought it would leſſen the Peoples Reverence and Devotion, if they paſſed into the draught, as *Origen* affirmed; and therefore he ſtarted another Opinion; *viz. That as Wax, when it is melted in the fire, throws off no ſuperfluities, but it paſſes indiſcernably away; ſo the Elements, or Myſteries, as he calls them, paſs imperceptibly into the ſubſtance of the Body, and ſo are conſumed together with it. Therefore,* ſaith he, *approach with Reverence, not ſuppoſing that you receive the divine body from a Man, but as with Tongs of Fire from the Seraphims:* Which the Author of the *Conſenſus Veterum* tranſlates, *but Fire from the Tongues of Seraphims.* S. *Chryſoſtom's* Words are, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν Σεραφὶμ τῇ λαβίδι τοῦ πυρὸς: And the Senſe is, *that the divine Body* (i. e. the *Euchariſt*, after *Conſecration*, being by the *divine Spirit made the divine Body*, as in St. *Chryſoſtom's Liturgy*, there is a particular Prayer for *the Holy Ghoſt to come, and ſo make the Bread to be the divine Body, or the holy Body of Chriſt*), is to be taken, *not with our Mouths*, which can only receive the Elements, but after *a divine manner, as with Tongs of fire from Seraphims*; by which he expreſſes the ſpiritual acts of Faith and Devotion, as moſt agreeable to that *divine Spirit* which makes the Elements to become the *holy Body of Chriſt.* But that St. *Chryſoſtom* did truly and firmly believe *the Subſtance* of the Bread to remain after Conſecration, I have already proved from his Epiſtle to *Cæſarius.*

P. 56.

Eucholog. p. 77.

P. I pray let us not go backward, having ſo much ground to run over ſtill.

Pr. I am content, if you will produce only thoſe who ſpeak of the *change of Subſtance*, and not ſuch as only mention *the Body and Blood of Chriſt after Conſecration*, which I have already told you, was the Language of the Church; and therefore all thoſe Teſtimonies are of no force in this matter.

P. Then I must quit the greatest part of what remains, as *Optatus*, *Gaudentius*, *S. Jerom*, and others; but I have some still left which will set you hard. What say you then to *Gregory Nyssen*, who saith, *the sanctified bread is changed into the body of the Word of God.* And he takes off your Answer of a *mystical Body*; for he puts the Question, *How the same Body can daily be distributed to the faithful throughout the World, it remaining whole and entire in it self?*

Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. 37.

Pr. Gregory Nyssen was a Man of Fancy, and he shewed it in that *Catechetical Discourse*: However, *Fronto Ducæus* thought it *a notable place to prove Transubstantiation*, which I wonder at, if he attended to the Design of it; which was to shew, that as our Bodies, by eating, became subject to Corruption, so by eating they become capable of Immortality; and this he saith, *Must be by receiving an immortal Body into our Bodies, such as the Body of Christ was*: But then, saith he, *how could that body, which is to remain whole in it self, be distributed to all the faithful over the whole Earth?* He answers, by saying, *That our Bodies do consist of Bread and Wine, which are their proper Nourishment; and Christ's Body being like ours, that was so too; which by the Union with the Word of God, was changed into a Divine Dignity.* But what is this to the *Eucharist*, you may say? He goes on therefore, *so I believe the sanctified Bread, by the power of the Word of God, to be changed into the Body of God the Word.* Not into that *Individual Body*, but after the same *manner*, by a *Presence* of the λόγος, or *God the Word* in it; and that this was his meaning, doth evidently appear by what follows. *For*, saith he, *that Body, viz.* to which, he was *Incarnate, was sanctified by the Inhabitation of the* λόγος, *dwelling in the Flesh; therefore, as the Bread was then changed into a Divine Dignity in the Body, so it is now; and the Bread is changed into the Body of the* λόγος, (not of *Jesus Christ*) *as it was said by the Word, This is my Body. And so by receiving this Divine Body into our bodies, they are made capable of Immortality.*

tality. And this is the true Account of *Gregory Nyſſen*'s meaning, which if it prove any thing, proves an *Impanation*, rather than *Tranſubſtantiation.*

P. But *Hilary*'s Teſtimony cannot be ſo avoided; who ſaith, *That we as truly eat Chriſt's Fleſh in the Sacrament, as he was truly Incarnate; and that we are to judg of this, not by carnal Reaſon, but by the Words of Chriſt*, who ſaid, *My Fleſh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* Nubes Teſtium, p. 124.

Pr. I do not deny this to be *Hilary*'s Senſe. But yet this proves nothing like to *Tranſubſtantiation.* For it amounts to no more than a *Real Preſence* of the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament; and you can make no Argument from hence, unleſs you can prove that the Body of Chriſt cannot be preſent, unleſs the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* be deſtroy'd, which is more than can be done, or than *Hilary* imagined. All that he aimed at, was to prove a *real Union* between Chriſt and his People, *That Chriſt was in them more than by meer conſent*; and to prove this, he lays hold of thoſe words of our Saviour, *My Fleſh is meat indeed*, &c. But the ſubſtantial Change of the Bread into the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body, ſignifies nothing to his purpoſe; and *Bellarmin* never ſo much as mentions *Hilary* in his proofs of *Tranſubſtantiation*, but only for the *real Preſence.* But I muſt add ſomething more, *viz.* that *Hilary* was one of the *firſt* who drew any Argument from the *literal Senſe of John 6.* I do not ſay, who did by way of *Accommodation*, apply them to the *Sacrament*, which others might do before him. But yet, there are ſome of the eldeſt Fathers, who do wholly exclude a literal Senſe, as *Tertullian* look'd on it, *As an Abſurdity that Chriſt ſhould be thought truly to give his Fleſh to eat. Quaſi vere carnem ſuam illis edendam determinaſſet.* And *Origen* ſaith, *It is a killing Letter, if thoſe Words be literally underſtood.* But this is to run into another debate, whereas our Buſineſs is about *Tranſubſtantiation.* If you have any more, let us now examine their Teſtimonies. Tertul. de Reſur. carn. c. 37. Orig. hom. 7. in Levit.

P. What

P. What ſay you then to St. *Ambroſe*, who ſpeaks home to the Buſineſs, for he makes *the Change to be above Nature, and into the Body of Chriſt, born of the Virgin*? There are long Citations out of him, but in theſe words lies the whole ſtrength of them.

Ambroſ. de his qui initiantur, c. 9.

Pr. I anſwer, ſeveral things for clearing of his meaning. (1.) That St. *Ambroſe* doth parallel *the Change* in the *Euchariſt*, with that in *Baptiſm*; and to prove *Regeneration therein*, he argues from the *miraculous Conception of Chriſt in the Womb of the Virgin*; but in Baptiſm no body ſuppoſes the *Subſtance* of the *Water* to be taken away; and therefore it cannot hold as to the other, from the *Supernatural Change*, which may be only with reſpect to ſuch a *Divine Influence*, which it had not before Conſecration. (2.) He doth purpoſely talk obſcurely and myſtically about this matter, as the Fathers were wont to do to thoſe, who were to be admitted to theſe *Myſteries*. Sometimes one would think he meant that the Elements are changed into *Chriſt's Individual Body born of the Virgin*: and yet preſently after, he diſtinguiſhes between the *true Fleſh of Chriſt, which was crucified and buried, and the Sacrament of his Fleſh*. If this were the ſame, what need any diſtinction? And that this *Sacramentum Carnis*, is meant of the *Euchariſt*, is plain by what follows; for he cites Chriſt's words, *This is my Body*. (3.) He beſt explains his own meaning, when he ſaith, not long after, *That the body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, is a Spiritual body, or a body produced by the Divine Spirit*; and ſo he parallels it with *that ſpiritual Food, which the* Iſraelites *did eat in the Wilderneſs*: And no man will ſay, that the *Subſtance* of the *Manna* was then loſt. And ſince your Authors make the ſame St. *Ambroſe*, to have written the Book *De Sacramentis*, there is a notable paſſage therein, which helps to explain this; for there he ſaith expreſly, *Non iſte Panis eſt qui vadit in Corpus, ſed ille Panis Vitæ Eternæ qui animæ noſtræ Subſtantiam fulcit. It is not the Bread which paſſes*

C. 3.

De Sacram. l. 5. c. 4.

passes into the Body, but the Bread of Eternal Life, which strengthens the Substance of our Soul. Where he not only calls it *Bread* after *Consecration*, which goes to *our Nourishment*; but he distinguishes it from *the Bread of Eternal Life, which supports the Soul*, which must be understood of *Divine Grace*, and not of any *Bodily Substance*.

P. I perceive you will not leave us one Father of the whole number.

Pr. Not one. And I hope this gives an incomparable Advantage to the Doctrine of the *Trinity* in point of *Tradition*, above *Transubstantiation*: when I have not only proved, that the greatest of the Fathers expresly denied it, but that there is not one in the whole number who affirmed it. For altho there were some difference in the way of explaining how the Eucharist was the Body and Blood of Christ; yet not one of them hitherto produced, doth give any countenance to your Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which the Council of *Trent* declared to have been *the constant belief of the Church in all Ages*; which is so far from being true, that there is as little ground to believe that, as *Transubstantiation* it self. And so much as to this Debate, concerning the comparing the Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Transubstantiation*, in point of *Tradition*; if you have any thing to say further, as to *Scripture* and *Reason*, I shall be ready to give you Satisfaction the next Opportunity.

F I N I S.

BOOKS *lately Printed for* W. Rogers.

THE Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, truly Repreſented; in Anſwer to a Book, Intituled, *A Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and Repreſented*, &c. Quarto, Third Edition.

An Anſwer to a Diſcourſe, Intituled, *Papiſts proteſting againſt Proteſtant Popery*; being a Vindication of *Papiſts* not *Miſrepreſented* by *Proteſtants*. 4*to*. Second Edition.

An Anſwer to the *Amicable Accommodation* of the Differences between the *Repreſenter* and the *Anſwerer*. Quarto.

A View of the whole Controverſie, between the *Repreſenter* and the *Anſwerer*; with an Anſwer to the *Repreſenter*'s laſt *Reply*. 4*to*.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Tranſubſtantiation* compared as to *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Tradition*; in a new Dialogue between a *Proteſtant* and a *Papiſt*, the firſt Part; Wherein an Anſwer is given to the late Proofs of the Antiquity of *Tranſubſtantiation*, in the Books called, *Conſenſus Veterum*, and *Nubes Teſtium*, &c. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and *Tranſubſtantiation*, compared as to *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Tradition*, in a new Dialogue between a *Proteſtant* and a *Papiſt*, the Second Part; Wherein the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is ſhewed to be agreeable to *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, and *Tranſubſtantiation* repugnant to both. Quarto.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature of Idolatry; in which the Biſhop of *Oxford*'s true and only Notion of Idolatry is Conſidered and Confuted. 4*to*.

The Abſolute Impoſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation demonſtrated. 4*to*.

A Letter to the Superiours, (whether Biſhops or Prieſts) which Approve or Licenſe the Popiſh Books in *England*, particularly to thoſe of the Jeſuits Order, concerning *Lewis Sabran* a Jeſuit.

A Preſervative againſt *Popery*; being ſome Plain Directions to Unlearned *Proteſtants*, how to Diſpute with *Romiſh* Prieſts. The Firſt Part. The Fourth Edition.

The Second Part of the Preſervative againſt Popery; ſhewing how contrary Popery is to the True Ends of the Chriſtian Religion. Fitted for the Inſtruction of Unlearned Proteſtants. The Second Edition.

A Vindication of both Parts of the Preſervative againſt Popery; in Anſwer to the Cavils of *Lewis Sabran*, Jeſuit.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature, Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church; wherein moſt of the Controverſies relating to the Church, are briefly and plainly ſtated. The Firſt Part. 4*to*.

Theſe Four laſt by *William Sherlock*, D. D. Maſter of the *Temple*.

Imprimatur.

Guil. Needham RR. in Chri-
sto P. ac D. D. Wilhelmo
Archiep. Cant. a Sac. Dom.

In Aedib. Lambeth.
Feb. 4. 1656.

Imprimatur,

Ex Ædib. Lambeth, Feb. 4. 1686.

Guil. Needham RR. in Christo P. ac D. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. *Cant.* a Sac. Dom.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY AND Transubstantiation COMPARED, AS TO Scripture, Reason, and Tradition, IN A New DIALOGUE between a *Protestant* and a *Papist*.

The Second part.

Wherein the Doctrine of the **Trinity** is shewed to be agreeable to Scripture and Reason, and **Transubstantiation** repugnant to both.

LONDON:
Printed for *William Rogers* at the *Sun* in *Fleet-street*, over against St. *Dunstan's Church*. MDCLXXXVII.

THE DOCTRINE OF PENANCE

Considered

Scripture, Reason, and Tradition.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION Compared, &c.

Pr. I Hope you are now at Leiſure to proceed with your parallel between the Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation, as to Scripture and Reaſon.

P. Yes, and am reſolved to make good all that I have ſaid, as to both thoſe.

Pr. And if you do, I will yield the Cauſe.

P. I begin with *Scripture.* And the whole Diſpute as to both, depends on this: Whether the Scripture is to be underſtood Literally or Figuratively. If Literally, then Tranſubſtantiation ſtands upon equal terms with the Trinity; if Figuratively, then the Trinity can no more be proved from Scripture, than Tranſubſtantiation.

Pr. As

Pr. As tho there might not be Reaſon for a *figurative Senſe* in one place, and a *literal* in another.

P. It ſeems then, you reſolve it into Reaſon.

Pr. And I pray, into what would you reſolve it? Into no Reaſon?

P. Into the Authority of the Church.

Pr. Without any Reaſon?

P. No: There may be Reaſon for that Authority, but not for the thing which I believe upon it.

Pr. Then you believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, meerly, becauſe the Church tells you it is the literal Senſe of Scripture which you are to follow. But ſuppoſe a Man ſees no Reaſon for this Authority of your Church; (as for my part, I do not) have you no Reaſon to convince ſuch a one that he ought to believe the Trinity?

P. Not I. For I think Men are bound to believe as the Church Teaches them, and for that Reaſon.

Pr. What is it, I pray, to believe?

P. To believe, is to give our Aſſent to what God reveals.

Pr. And hath God revealed the Doctrine of the Trinity to the Church in this Age?

P. No; it was revealed long ago.

Pr. How doth it appear?

P. By the Scripture ſenſed by the Church.

Pr. But whence come you to know that the Church is to give the Senſe of the Scriptures? Is it from the Scripture, or not?

P. From the Scripture doubtleſs, or elſe we could not believe upon the Churches Teſtimony.

Pr. But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be, about the Senſe of theſe places which relate to the Churches Authority, how can a Man come to the certain Senſe of them?

P. Hold a little, I ſee whither you are leading me; you would fain draw me into a Snare, and have me ſay, I believe

lieve the ſenſe of Scripture from the Authority of the Church, and the Authority of the Church from the ſenſe of Scripture.

Pr. Do you not ſay ſo in plain terms?

P. Give me leave to anſwer for my ſelf. I ſay in the caſe of the Churches Authority, I believe the Senſe of Scripture without relying on the Churches Authority.

Pr. And why not as well in any other? Why not as to the Trinity, which to my underſtanding, is much plainer there, than the Churches Authority?

P. That is ſtrange: Is not the Church often ſpoken of in Scripture? *Tell the Church. Upon this Rock will I build my Church*, &c.

Pr. But we are not about the Word *Church*, which is no doubt there, but the Infallible Authority of the Church; and whether that be more clear in the Scripture than the Doctrine of the Trinity.

P. I ſee you have a mind to change your Diſcourſe, and to run off from the Trinity to the Churches Authority in Matters of Faith; which is a beaten Subject.

Pr. Your Church doth not tell you ſo; and therefore you may upon your own grounds be deceived; and I aſſure you that you are ſo; for I intended only to ſhew you, that for Points of Faith we muſt examine and compare Scripture our ſelves, and our Faith muſt reſt on Divine Revelation therein contained.

P. Then you think the Trinity can be proved from Scripture?

Pr. Or elſe I ſhould never believe it.

P. But thoſe places of Scripture you go upon, may bear a *figurative Senſe*, as John 10. 30. *I and my Father are one*; and 1 John 5. 7. *And thoſe three are one*; and if they do ſo, you can never prove the Trinity from them.

Pr.

Pr. I say therefore, That the Doctrine of the Trinity doth not depend merely on these places, but on very many others, which help to the true sense of these; but Transubstantiation depends upon one single Expression, *This is my Body*, which relates to a *figurative thing* in the Sacrament; and which hath other Expressions joined with it, which are owned to be *figurative*; *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; and which in the literal sense cannot prove Transubstantiation, as your own Writers confess, and which is disproved by those places of Scripture, which assert the Bread and the Fruit of the Vine to remain after Consecration.

P. Shew the Literal Sense as to the *Trinity* to be necessary; for I perceive you would fain go off again.

Pr. Will you promise to hold close to the Argument your self?

P. You need not fear me.

Pr. I pray tell me, Were there not false Religions in the World when Christ came into it to plant the true Religion?

P. Yes; but how far is this from the business?

Pr. Have a little Patience; Did not Christ design by his Doctrine to root out those false Religions?

P. That is evident from Scripture and Church History.

Pr. Then Christs Religion and theirs were inconsistent.

P. And what then?

Pr. Wherein did this Inconsistency lie?

P. The *Gentiles* worshipped false Gods instead of the true One.

Pr. Then the Christian Religion teaches the worship of the true God instead of the false ones.

P. Who doubts of that?

Pr. Then it cannot teach the Worſhip of a falſe God inſtead of the true One.

P. A falſe God is one that is ſet up in oppoſition to the true God, as the Gods of the Heathens were.

Pr. Is it lawful by the Chriſtian Doctrine to give proper Divine Worſhip to a Creature?

P. I think not; for Chriſt ſaid, *Thou ſhalt Worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*: Which our Church underſtands of proper Divine Worſhip.

Pr. But the Scripture requires proper Divine Worſhip to be given to Chriſt; which is to require proper Divine Worſhip to be given to a Creature, if Chriſt be not true God by Nature.

P. May not God communicate his own Worſhip to him?

Pr. But God hath ſaid, *He will not give his Glory to another*, Iſa. 42. 8. And the Reaſon is conſiderable, which is there given; *I am the Lord, that is my name*; which ſhews that none but the true *Jehovah* is capable of Divine Worſhip: for Adoration is done to God only on the account of his incommunicable Perfections, and therefore the Reaſon of Divine Worſhip cannot reach to any Creature.

P. Not without Gods Will and Pleaſure. But may not God advance a mere Creature to that Dignity, as to require Divine Worſhip to be given to him by his fellow-creatures?

Pr. Wherein lies the nature of that which you call proper Divine Worſhip?

P. In a due eſteem of God in our Minds, as the firſt Cauſe and laſt End of his Creatures, and ſuch Acts as are agreeable thereto.

Pr. Then proper Divine Worſhip doth ſuppoſe an Eſteem of God as infinitely above his Creatures; and how then is it poſſible for us to give the ſame Worſhip to God, and to a Creature? For if the diſtance be infinite between God

and his Creatures, and we must judg of things as they are, then we must in our minds suppose a Creature to be infinitely distant from God; and if we do so, How is it possible to give the same Divine Worship in this sense to God, and to any Creature?

P. And what now would you infer from hence?

Pr. Do not you see already? *viz.* that God cannot be supposed to allow Divine Worship to be given to Christ, if he were a mere Creature; and therefore since such Divine Worship is required by the Christian Doctrine, it follows, that those expressions which speak of his being *One with the Father*, cannot be *figuratively* understood.

P. But where is it, that such Divine Worship is required to be given to Christ in Scripture? For, according to my Principles, the Church is to set the bounds and measures of Divine Worship, and to declare what Worship is due to God; what to Christ; what to Saints and Angels; what to men upon Earth; what to Images, Sacraments, *&c.* And if we depart from this Rule, I know not where we shall fix.

Pr. I pray tell me, doth the difference between God and his Creatures, depend on the will of the Church?

P. No.

Pr. Is it then in the Churches Power to give that to a Creature, which belongs only to God?

P. I think not.

Pr. Who then is to be judg what belongs to God, and what not? God or the Church?

P. God himself, if he pleases.

Pr. Then our business is to search what his Will and Pleasure is in this matter, by reading the Scriptures, wherein his Will is contained: And there we find it expressed, *That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, John 5. 23. *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, Heb. 1. 6.

Blessing

Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that ſitteth on the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever, Revel. 4. 13. *That at the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, &c.* Phil. 2. 9. If it were Gods great deſign, by the Chriſtian Doctrine, to reſtore in the world a due ſenſe of the infinite diſtance between God and his Creatures; could any thing be more repugnant to it, than in the ſame Doctrine to advance a creature to a participation of the ſame Divine Honour with himſelf? So that in plain truth, the Idolatry of the world lay only in a bad choice of the Creatures they were to worſhip, and not in giving proper Divine Worſhip to a Creature; for that Chriſtianity it ſelf not only allows, but requires, on ſuppoſition that Chriſt were God merely by Office, and was originally a Creature, as we are. But I pray obſerve the force of the Apoſtles Argument, ſpeaking of the *Gentile* Idolatry; he ſaith it lay in this, *That they did ſervice unto them, which by Nature are no Gods,* Gal. 4. 8.

P. You know, I muſt now perſonate the *Anti-Trinitarian*; and he anſwers, That *by Nature* no more is implied, than *truly and really*, i. e. God did not advance thoſe Creatures among the *Gentiles* to that Worſhip and Honour, which he hath done Chriſt.

Pr. Then you make it lawful by the Goſpel to believe Chriſt to be a mere Creature, and at the ſame time to give him Divine Worſhip, which ſuppoſes him not to be a Creature; and ſo you muſt believe him to be a Creature, and not to be a Creature, at the ſame time.

P. How do you make that appear?

Pr. From your own words; for you ſay, proper Divine Worſhip lies in a due eſteem of God in our minds, as the firſt Cauſe and laſt End, and in actions agreeable thereto; then to give Divine Worſhip to God, we muſt believe him to be above all Creatures as to his Nature and Being; and there-

fore to give Christ Divine Worship, must imply our believing him not to be a Creature, and to be a Creature at the same time.

P. But the meaning of Divine Worship here must not then relate to Acts of the Mind, but to outward Acts of Adoration in the Church.

Pr. Were the *Gentiles* guilty of Idolatry in that respect, or not?

P. Yes; but not those, whom God requires to Worship in such a manner.

Pr. Then the Sin of *Gentile*-Idolatry lay only in giving Divine Worship to a Creature without Gods command; which lessens it to that degree, as to make Will-worship and Idolatry the same; and to blame the Apostles, for making such a dreadful Sin of it, and disswading Christians so much from returning to the Practice of it: For they had the priviledg of giving Divine Worship to a Creature by Gods command, which others were damned for doing without a command; which makes the Christian Religion not to appear so reasonable, as the *Anti-Trinitarians* contend it is. But here are four foul mistakes in point of *Reason*, which they are guilty of. (1.) In making the Sin of Idolatry so Arbitrary a thing; which depends not on the Nature of the Object which is worshipped, but on the Will and Pleasure of God. (2.) In making the *Gentiles* guilty of a great Sin, meerly in wanting a Divine command, which was out of their Power. (3.) In making the Christian Religion to set up the Worship of a Creature, when its design was to root out Idolatry. (4.) In making a Fictitious God, or a Creature to be advanced to the Throne of God. Which I think is far more contradictious to Reason, than a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the same Nature. For nothing can be more absurd than to make

Rom. 1. 21, 23, 24.
1 Cor. 10. 7, 14.
1 Joh. 5. 21.

that

that to be God, which wants all the eſſential Attributes and Perfections of God; as every Creature muſt do: Such as Self-Exiſtence, Eternity, Independency, Immenſity, Omnipotency, &c. What a Contradiction is it, to ſuppoſe a weak, impotent, depending, confined, created God? And ſuch every Creature muſt be in its Nature, or elſe it is no Creature. I do not at all wonder to find the *Socinians* after this, to leſſen the natural Knowledg of God, and his infinite Perfections, both as to Power and Knowledg; for it was their concernment to bring the Notion of God as low as poſſible, that a Creature might be in the nearer Capacity of being made God. But thoſe who conſider and know what God is, and what he muſt be, if he be God, will find far greater difficulty in making Man to be God, than in believing God to be made Man. For This implies no greater difficulty, than meerly as to our Conception, how an infinite Being can be ſo united to a finite, as to become one Perſon; which implies no repugnancy, but only ſome thing above our Capacity to comprehend. And we confeſs our ſelves puzled in the manner of conceiving how a finite Spitit, which can paſs through a Body, can be ſo united to it, as to make a Man by that Union; yet we all acknowledg the Truth of this. But to ſuppoſe a Creature capable of being made God, is to overthrow the eſſential difference between God and his Creatures, and the infinite Diſtance between them. Which is of very pernicious Conſequence, as to the great ends of the Chriſtian Religion, which were to reform the World, and to reſtore the Diſtinction between God and his Creatures; which by the prevalency of Idolatry was almoſt loſt in the World: The Supreme God being hardly diſcerned in ſuch a croud of created and fictitious Gods. And this very Argument is enough to turn my Stomack againſt *Socinianiſm* or *Arianiſm*.

P. I had thought all Men of ſenſe among you, had been *Socinians*; I have often heard them charged with being ſo.

Pr. You ſee how groſly you are deceived, notwithſtanding your pretence to Infallibility. I do not pretend to any deep reach, but I ſee reaſon enough to be no *Socinian.*

P. Let us return to our Matter in hand. What ſay you to thoſe Texts which are ſaid to be inconſiſtent with the literal Senſe of thoſe before mention'd, which relate to the Unity between Father and Son?

Pr. What Texts do you mean?

P. What ſay you to *Joh.* 10. from the 30. *to the* 39?

Pr. I wonder what it is produced for.

P. It is ſaid, Joh. 10. 30. I and my Father are one; *now it is highly unreaſonable to interpret theſe words literally, becauſe of thoſe which follow.*

Pr. How doth that appear? For *v.* 31. it is ſaid, *That the* Jews *took up ſtones to ſtone him:* Which ſhews, that they look'd on him as ſpeaking Blaſphemy. But what Blaſphemy was it for Chriſt to declare an Unity of Conſent between him and his Father; which in Truth is nothing, but doing his Father's Will? Therefore it is plain that the *Jews* did apprehend more in thoſe Words of our Saviour. And they explain themſelves, *v.* 33. what they underſtood by them, *Becauſe that thou being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God.* Which ſhews that they thought not an *Unity* of *Conſent*, but of *Nature*, was meant.

P. But Chriſt's anſwer ſhews, that he ſpeaks only of a *God by Office*, and not *by Nature*, v. 34. *Jeſus anſwered them, Is it not written in your Law, I ſaid ye are Gods?*

Pr. I pray go on, and ſee how Chriſt argues, v. 35, 36. *If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and*

and the Scripture cannot be broken; ſay ye of him, whom the Father hath ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid I am the Son of God?

P. This only ſhews that Chriſt had greater Reaſon to be called *God*, but not that he was ſo by Nature.

Pr. I pray go on ſtill, v. 37, 38. *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, tho ye believe not me, believe the Works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.*

P. Is it not ſaid elſewhere, *That he that keepeth his Commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him?* 1 Joh. 3. 24. Would you hence infer an Unity of Nature between Chriſt and Believers?

Pr. I do not lay the weight on the Phraſe, but as it is the Concluſion of the Diſpute between Chriſt and the *Jews*. And it ought to be obſerved, that this was the end of the third Conference between Chriſt and the *Jews* upon this Argument. The firſt was *John* 5. and then from Chriſt's ſaying, *The Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, v. 17. the *Jews* infer'd v. 18. *That he made himſelf equal with God.* In the ſecond Conference, *John* 8. he ſaid, *Before* Abraham *was, I am*, v. 58. *And then the* Jews *took up ſtones to caſt at him.* After this followed this third Conference, *John.* 10. and this runs again into the ſame point, *That he being a Man, made himſelf God.* And theſe Conferences were all publick, in or near the Temple, and this laſt was in *Solomons Porch*, *John* 10. 23. a Place of great reſort, and near the place where the *Sanhedrim* ſate, who were the Judges in the Caſe of Blaſphemy. Now the force of my Argument from hence, lies in theſe things:

(1.) That Chriſt certainly knew, that the *Jews* did think by his Diſcourſe, *That he made himſelf equal with God.*

(2.) That

2. That if it were not true, it was notorious Blaſphemy, and ſo eſteemed by the *Jews*.

3. That ſuch a miſtake ought to have been preſently corrected, and in the plaineſt manner; as we find it was done by St. *Paul*, when the men of *Lyſtra* ſaid, *The Gods are come down to us in the likeneſs of men*; for he ran in preſently among them, and ſaid, *We are men of like paſſions with you*, Acts 14. 11, 15. It is impoſſible for me to think, that if Chriſt had known himſelf to be a meer man, he would have ſuffered the *Jews* to have run away with ſuch a miſtake as this, without giving them the cleareſt and plaineſt information; whereas in all his Anſwers he vindicates himſelf, and endeavours rather to faſten thoſe Impreſſions upon them, as appears by this concluſion of the laſt Conference, *That ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.* Doth this look like correcting a dangerous miſtake in the *Jews*? And is it not rather a juſtification of that ſenſe, which they took his words in? And in the firſt Conference, *John* 5. Our Saviour is ſo far from doing as St. *Paul* did, that he challenges Divine Honour as due to himſelf, *That all men ſhould honour the Son, as they honour the Father*, v. 23. From whence it follows, that Chriſt muſt be charged as one, who being a meer man, did affect Divine Honour; or elſe, that being *God* as well as Man, he looked on it as juſtly due to him. I pray tell me what ſenſe do your Friends the *Socinians* make of thoſe words of St. *Paul*, Phil. 2. 6, 7. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himſelf of no Reputation*, &c.

P. The ſenſe they give, is this, that he did not make a ſhew or Oſtentation of his own Greatneſs, but ſtudiouſly concealed it, and therein ſhewed his great Humility.

Pr. But

Pr. But is there any Greatneſs like that of *Divine Honour*? and yet this he challenged to himſelf.

P. But he knew what the Father deſigned him for, and ſo ſpake thoſe things by way of Prediction.

Pr. He knew no Creature could deſerve Divine Worſhip, and he deliver'd that as part of his own Doctrine; and therefore thoſe Words, where he is ſaid, *to make himſelf equal with God*, muſt be underſtood of *Nature*, and not of *Office*.

P. But St. *John* 17. 22. ſaith, that Chriſt prayed to his Father, for his Diſciples, *That they may be one, as we are one*; and that is not by Unity of Nature.

Pr. I grant it. But our Saviour there ſpeaks of a true, but a lower kind of Unity; or elſe the *Socinians* muſt think every Believer as capable of Divine Honour, as Chriſt himſelf, if they take thoſe Words ſtrictly, *That they may be one, as we are one*.

P. St. *Paul* ſaith, *He that planteth, and he that watereth, is one*, 1 Cor. 3. 8.

Pr. Who doubts but there are other ſorts of Unities, beſides that of Nature? But, doth this prove that there is no Unity of Nature between the Father and the Son? If we have no better Arguments againſt Tranſubſtantiation, we will give over diſputing.

P. I know you have other Arguments for the Trinity, but they prove as little without the Authority of the Church; as *from thoſe places where Chriſt is called God*, as *Joh.* 1. 1, 2. *Rom.* 9. 5, *&c.*

Pr. And I think the Argument from thoſe places, very good and ſtrong, eſpecially from *John* 1. 1, 2, 3. and it ſeems directly contrary to the whole deſign of Scripture to call any one *God over all*, *Bleſſed for evermore*, as Chriſt is called, *Rom.* 9. 5. but he that is God by *Nature*.

P. How do you prove that *John* 1. 1. relates to any thing beyond *the beginning of the Gospel, and that Christ the Word, was before* John *the Baptists Preaching?*

Pr. I desire any one to read the Text impartially, and he will find the *Socinian* sense to be unnatural, forced, obscure and jejune, proving a thing of no moment at that time; but the Sense we give, to be strong, weighty, consistent, and of very great Consequence at that time, when the *Cerinthians* denied the Divinity of Christ. The Sentences are short, the Words lofty and significant, the manner of beginning unusual; so that any one would expect some great and extraordinary matter to be said in these few Verses; but what a frustration were this, if after all, they intended no more, than that altho *John Baptist* preached in publick before *Christ*, yet that Christ was in being before that? Which is a Sense so mean, so remote from the occasion of his Writing, as it is deliver'd by the Ancients, that nothing but a miserable necessity could make Men of Wit and Subtilty to put such a Sense upon St. *John's* Words.

P. But they deny there was any such occasion of St. *John's* writing, as the *Cerinthians Heresy* at that time.

Pr. I know *Socinus* doth so; but he might as well have denied that there was any such Person as *Cerinthus*. And I think the *Cerinthian Heresy* not only to have been the occasion of St. *John's* Writing, but that the understanding of it, gives the greatest and truest light to the Words of the Evangelist, shewing the force and importance of them.

P. Wherein I pray, did that Heresy consist?

Pr. I shall not meddle with other parts of it, but only what relates to the present Subject; and that lay in these things.

(1.) That

(1.) That there was a Supreme and unknown Father, who was *before the Beginning*, and therefore they called him προαρχὴν, who was the Fountain of all Emanations. *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 1. 19.

(2.) That the World was not made by him, but by a Power at a diſtance from him, called *Demiurgus*, *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 25. And in the *Egyptian* School where *Cerinthus* was educated, the Λόγος *Word*, was one of the intermediate Emanations between *the Father*, and *the Demiurgus*, *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 23.

(3.) That this World was in a ſtate of Darkneſs and Confuſion, as to the ſupreme Father of all; only ſome few had ſome beams of Light from him, by which they knew him.

(4.) That *Jeſus* was a mere Man, born as other Men are, of *Joſeph* and *Mary*, but of extraordinary Goodneſs, Wiſdom, and Sanctity.

(5.) That the Supreme Father at his Baptiſm did ſend down a Divine Power upon him, in the ſhape of a Dove, which enabled him to declare the unknown Father, and to work Miracles, which returned to its own πλήρωμα, or *Fulneſs* above, when *Jeſus* ſuffer'd.

This is a ſhort Scheme of that Hereſy, as delivered by the ancient Fathers. And now let any one compare St. *Johns* Words with it; and he will find his deſign was to countermine this Hereſy by two things.

(1.) That the Λόγος *Word*, was Eternal. For the *Cerinthians* ſaid, the Λόγος was not *in the beginning*, but made a great ſpace of time between the eternal Being of the Father, and the Emanation of the Λόγος, wherein he was *in perfect Silence*, as *Irenæus* expreſſes it (*l.* 1. *c.* 1.) And ſo *in the beginning*, doth imply the Eternity of the *Word*. But that is not all, for he ſaith, *it was with God, and was God*, and was the *Demiurgus*, or the Maker of the World, and the Revealer of God to

Mankind, *Joh.* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10. And ſo there was no place for thoſe ſeveral Emanations between God and the Λόγος and *Demiurgus*, as the *Cerinthians* ſaid.

(2.) That the Λόγος or *Word*, was *Incarnate*, which he affirms, v. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us, &c.* and was *the only begotten Son of the Father*; and ſo he not only cuts off the other Emanations, but declares that *Jeſus* was far from being a mere Man. And to this purpoſe he brings in the Teſtimony of *John Baptiſt*, *v.* 15. and applies what he had ſaid to the Perſon of *Jeſus Chriſt*, *v.* 17. Now this being St. *Johns* deſign, his Words afford a Demonſtration to us of the Union of the Divine and Human Nature in Chriſt, when he ſaith, *The Word was made Fleſh.*

P. But doth not the Scripture in other places imply that there is a ſubordination in Chriſt to his Father, which is not conſiſtent with ſuch an Equality of Nature; ſee *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 5.— 15. 27, 28. *Rev.* 3. 12.

Pr. The firſt place is a proof for the Divinity of Chriſt; for the Words are; *But unto the Son*, he ſaith, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.* It is true, in the next verſe, it is ſaid with reſpect to his Office, *Therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee*, &c. But we do not deny that Chriſt was anointed as Mediator, and in that reſpect, God was his God; but doth this prove that he that is Mediator, cannot have a Divine Nature in Conjunction with the Human?

The ſecond Place, I ſuppoſe, is miſtaken, 1 *Cor.* 8. not 4. and 5. but 6 verſe, *But unto us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him.* And this is one of the ſtrongeſt holds of the *Socinians*. But two Conſiderations will take off the ſeeming force of it.

(1.) That

(1.) That the Apoſtle in his diſputes with the *Gentile* Idolaters, concerning whom he ſpeaks, *v.* 4, 5. doth utterly deny any Divinity in the Beings they worſhipped inſtead of God, when he ſaith, *An Idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one.* He knew very well that they worſhipped many, *v.* 5. *As there be Gods many, and Lords many among them; but unto us* (Chriſtians) *there is but one God, and one Lord:* i. e. we have but one Supreme God, to whom we give Divine Worſhip; and inſtead of the multitude of *Mediators*, we have but *one Mediator*; and ſo his deſign is in oppoſition to their *many Gods*, to aſſert the *Unity* of the *Divine Nature*, (not ſo as to exclude a diſtinction of Perſons, but thereby to exclude other Gods as the proper Object of Worſhip), and the *Unity* of a *Mediator*, in oppoſition to their *many Lords*.

(2.) That if this place excludes Chriſt from the Unity of Nature with God, it doth exclude him from being the Object of Divine Worſhip; for it ſaith, *That there is no other God, but One*; therefore no Creature can be made God: *And to us there is but One God, the Father*; therefore the Son cannot be God. If therefore the name *Lord* be taken in oppoſition to *God*, then Chriſt cannot be *God* in any ſenſe; for we muſt have but *One God*: but the plain meaning of the Apoſtle was, That by *one Lord* he meant *one Mediator*, by whom alone we have, in this new frame of things by the Goſpel, acceſs unto God the Father.

The third place, 1 *Cor.* 15. 27,28. ſpeaks plainly of Chriſts Kingdom, as Mediator.

The fourth place, *Rev.* 3. 12. where Chriſt ſpeaks ſeveral times of *my God*, proves no more than his words on the Croſs, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me:* For ſurely Chriſt might own a particular Relation to God, and Intereſt in him, as he was in human Nature, without overthrowing the Divine Nature in him.

P. But

P. But he owns, *That though he is to be our Judg, he knows not the time*, Mark 13. 32. Which ſeems inconſiſtent with the Divine Nature, which knoweth all things.

Pr. The Son there ſpoken of, was Chriſt, as endued with a human Soul, when he was upon earth; which could not underſtand a ſecret ſo much out of the reach of mans underſtanding, without immediate Revelation. But it was not neceſſary by virtue of the Union of both Natures, that the Divine Nature ſhould communicate to the human Soul of Chriſt all Divine Myſteries: but as the human Body was notwithſtanding ſubject to Paſſions and Infirmities incident to it, ſo the human Soul might continue ignorant of the Day of Judgment in this ſtate; both to let us know how great that ſecret is, and that Chriſt had the proper capacity of a human Soul, which could not extend to ſuch things without Divine Revelation.

P. There is one Argument more, which ſeems to prove Chriſts Divinity, and doth not; *viz. The making of all things viſible and inviſible, being attributed to him*, John 1. 3. Heb. 1. 10. Col. 1. 16, 17, 18, 19.

Pr. Now I confeſs this doth more than ſeem to me to be a very ſtrong Argument; and that for this Reaſon, the Apoſtle ſaith, *The inviſible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things which are made, even his Eternal Power and Godhead*, Rom. 1. 20. Was this Argument of the Apoſtle good or not?

P. No doubt it was.

Pr. Then the Creation of the World is an Invincible Proof of the true God.

P. What follows?

Pr. Then if *the making of all things* be attributed to Chriſt, he muſt be true God; but this is plain in the New Teſtament, in which the making of all things is as clearly attributed to the Son, as it is to the Father; *All things*

ſaith

ſaith St. *John*, *were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made*, John 1. 3. *For by him were all things created*, ſaith St. *Paul*, *that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him, and for him*, Col. 1. 16. *Thou, Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands*, Heb. 1. 10. Now compare theſe expreſſions with thoſe wherein the Creation is attributed to the Father, *The world* is ſaid *to be made by him*, Rom. 1. 20. *That he hath created all things*, Rev. 4. 11. *That of him, and for him, and to him, are all things*, Rom. 11. 36. And let any impartial mind diſcern the difference. Therefore we have as much Reaſon from Scripture to believe Chriſt to be God, as we have from the Creation of things to believe a God.

P. But you do not take notice of the different expreſſions in Scripture, concerning the Father and the Son; *All things are ſaid to be of the Father, and by the Son*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *And that the Father created all things by Jeſus Chriſt*, Eph. 3. 9. which proves no more, than that the Son was Gods Inſtrument in the Creation.

Pr. What do you mean by *Gods Inſtrument in the Creation?* Do you think one Creature can create another? How then can the Creation prove an Infinite Power? If you believe the Inſtrument uncreated, then you muſt aſſert him to be *true God by Nature*; and then we have all we deſire.

P. But the *Socinians* do not like this Anſwer of the *Arians*, and therefore they interpret theſe places, of the ſtate of things *under the Goſpel*, and not of the *Creation* of the *World*.

Pr. They

Pr. They have not one jot mended the matter; for,

(1.) Where the new Creation is ſpoken of, ſome circumſtances are added, which limit the ſenſe to it, as when St. *Paul* ſaith, *We are created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works that we ſhoul walk in them.* Eph. 2. 10. VVho could poſſibly underſtand this of the old Creation? And ſo, *If any man be in Chriſt Jeſus, he is a new Creatnre,* 2 Cor. 5. 17. But in the other places the ſame Expreſſions are uſed, which are attributed to the old Creation, without limitation from circumſtances, or from the Context and occaſion of them.

(2.) There are ſome things ſaid to be created by *Chriſt Jeſus*, which cannot relate to the new Creation; for *by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or Powers.* Col. 1. 16. How are theſe created by Preaching the Goſpel, when they are uncapable of the proper means of it, which are the Doctrine of the remiſſion of Sins upon Repentance, and the Renewing and Sanctifiing Grace of God?

P. But St. *Paul* doth not mention *the Heaven and Earth*, but only intellectual Beings, Angels, and Men, and therefore he ſpeaks of the new Creation.

Pr. A mighty Argument indeed! Do not *all things* comprehend the Heaven and Earth? And the particular enumeration of Angels by ſeveral denominations, ſhews that he ſpeaks of another Creation diſtinct from that by the Goſpel preached to the VVorld; for the Apoſtles were Chriſts Inſtruments in this new Creation, which they could not be to the Inviſible Powers above.

P. We have now gone through *the true and only Grounds of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

Pr. You

Pr. You are extreamly mistaken. For we have other grounds besides these, although these may be sufficient.

P. Name one more.

Pr. I will name several, which you cannot disallow.

P. What are they?

Pr. The several Heads of Arguments made use of by Cardinal *Bellarmin*, to prove the Divinity of Christ: Who alone is a convincing Evidence of the vast disparity between the Proofs of this Doctrine, and of *Transubstantiation* from *Scripture*. For,

1. He proves Christ's Divinity from those places of the Old Testament, which are expounded in the New; being in the Old Testament, spoken of the true God; and in the New applied to Christ. As *Numb.* 21. 5, 6. compared with 1 *Cor.* 10. 9. *Exod.* 20. 2. with *Jude* 5. *Psal.* 68. 18. with *Eph.* 4. 8, 9. *Psal.* 97. 7. & 102. 25, 26. with *Heb.* 1. 6, 10, 11. *Isa.* 6. 1, 3. with *John* 12. 41. and *Revel.* 4. 8. *Isa.* 8. 14. with *Luke* 2. 34. and *Rom.* 9. 33. *Isa.* 40. 3. with *Mat.* 3. 3. *Mark* 1. 3. *Luke* 1. 76. *John* 1. 23.— *Isa.* 45. 23. with *Rom.* 14. 11. — *Isa.* 44. 6. with *Revel.* 1. 8, 17. *Mal.* 3. 1. with *Mat.* 11. 10. Bell. de Christo. l. 1. c. 4, &c.

2. From the Places of the Old Testament, which attribute to Christ those things which belong to God; as *Power and Adoration*, Psal. 2. 7, 8, 12. *Being the first and last*, Isa. 48. 1. 12, 16. *Working Miracles*, Isa. 35. 5. *Being the God of Israel*, Isa. 52. 5, 6. *The only God*, Isa. 45. 5, 6. *The Lord of Hosts*, Zach. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11. *Jehovah*, Zach. 3. 2. *Pouring out of the Spirit*, Zach. 12. 10.

3. From the Places of the New Testament, which attribute Divinity to Christ. As when he is called, *the Son of the Living God*, Mat. 16. 16. *The only begotten Son of God*, John 3. 16. *His own Son*, Rom. 8. 32. *His true Son*, 1 Joh. 5. 20. *His dear Son*, Col. 1. 13. *His Son above all others*, Heb. 1. 5. *The express Image of his Person*, Heb. 1. 3. *Making himself equal with God*, John 5. 18. *Being one*

 with

with the Father, Joh. 10. 30. *Lord and God*, John 20. 28. *God bleſſed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5. *Who thought it no robbery to be equal with God*, Phil. 2. 6. *One with the Father and Spirit*, 1 John 5. 7. *The true God*, 1 John 5. 20.

4. From the proper Names of God, *Iſa.* 9. 6. *John* 20. 28. *Acts* 20. 28. *Rom.* 9. 5. *Revel.* 4. 8. 1 *John* 3. 16. The name *Jehovah*, *Jer.* 23. 5, 8. *Iſa.* 40. 3. *The Lord*, by which the LXX render Jehovah, *Mat.* 21. 3. *Joh.* 13. 13. *The moſt High*, Pſal. 87. 5. *A Name above every Name*, Phil. 2. 9. *The Inviſible One*, 1 Tim. 1. 17, & 6. 16. *The God of Glory*, Act. 7. 2. 1 Cor. 2. 8. Pſal. 24. 7, 8, 9. *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*, 1 Tim. 6. 15. Revel. 17. 14. & 19. 16. *The one Lord*, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *The true God*, John 5. 20. *The only Lord*, Jud. 4. *The great God and our Saviour*, Titus 2. 13.

5. From the proper Attributes of God; as *Eternity*, Prov. 8. 22, 23. Mic. 5, 2. Joh. 1. 1,—— 17. 5. *Immenſity*, John 3. 13. Mat. 18. 20. *Omnipotency*, Rev. 1. 8.—— 4. 8. —— 11. 17. *Wiſdom*, Coloſ. 2. 3. Joh. 21. 17. *Majeſty and Adoration*, Heb. 1. 6. Mal. 3. 1. *Invocation*, Joh. 14. 13. Acts 7. 59. & 9. 14. 2 Cor. 12. 8. 1 Cor. 1. 3. 2 Joh. 3.

6. From the proper Works of God: as not only *Creation*, (of which already) but *Conſervation*, Heb. 1. 3. Coloſ. 1. 17. *Salvation*, Matth. 1. 21. *Foretelling future Events*, Joh. 13. 19. 1 Pet. 1. 11. Rev. 2. 23. *Working Miracles by his own Power*, Mark. 4. 39. and *giving Power to others to work them*, Mat. 10. 1.

What think you now of the Proofs of the Trinity in Scripture? Do you think *Bellarmin* could produce any thing like this for Tranſubſtantiation? No; ſo far from it, that where he ſets himſelf in a whole Chapter to prove it from Scripture, he produces a *Firſt* without a *Second*. *The firſt Argument*, ſaith he, *is taken from Chriſt's Words, This is my Body.* Very well! but where is the *Second?* For no more could be produced, but this one ſingle Paſ-

Bell. de Euch. l. 3. c 19.

ſage,

ſage, about which he ſpends his whole Chapter, and then betakes himſelf preſently to the *Fathers*.

P. But one plain and clear place is ſufficient, if we be certain of the ſenſe of that one; for we are as much bound to believe God when we are ſure he ſpeaks it once, as an hundred times.

Pr. We have been all this while comparing theſe two Doctrines as to *Scripture*, and now you ſee the diſproportion ſo very great, as to *number* and *variety*, you ſay, *one is as good as an hundred*; but that one had need to be wonderfully clear, which this is very far from, ſince many of your own Writers do confeſs Tranſubſtantiation cannot be drawn from it; as *Bellarmin* himſelf owns, and he affirms it *not to be improbable, that no place of Scripture is ſo clear and expreſs for Tranſubſtantiation, but learned and acute Men may doubt whether it can be drawn from it, ſetting aſide the Churches Declaration.* But neither *Bellarmin*, nor any one who attends to the force of the former Proofs of the Divinity of Chriſt, can ſay, that any *reaſonable Man* can doubt of it; and that he muſt at laſt reſolve all into the Church's Authority. Cap. 23.

P. Have not learned and acute Men doubted of the Divinity of Chriſt, as of Tranſubſtantiation? And therefore in that reſpect they are both alike.

Pr. We do not inſiſt upon Men's bare doubting, but on the *Reaſon* of their doubting. And when but one ſingle Place is produced, which is yeilded not to be ſufficient of it ſelf to prove the Doctrine; there is much more cauſe of doubting, than where ſuch multitudes of Places are produced; and no doubt is made by thoſe who favour *Tranſubſtantiation*, but that they do fully prove the Divinity of Chriſt.

P. It ſeems then we muſt come to *Reaſon* at laſt. And for my part, I muſt tell you, *I I think that Parallel much the eaſieſt. For, that three diſtinct Perſons ſhould be in one*

individual Nature, and that the moſt pure and ſimple Being, ſeems to me to be more abſurd than Tranſubſtantiation.

Pr. Let us ſet aſide the *comparing* Abſurdities at preſent, and only examin in point of *Reaſon*, the great Abſurdity of *three Perſons being in one Individual Divine Nature.*

P. I did hardly believe you would have the courage to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity in point of Reaſon; but I ſee you are a bold Man, and will venture farther than wiſer Men.

Pr. It may be others have not had the leiſure or curioſity to examine a Myſtery believed to be ſo much out of the reach of our Underſtanding; or have confounded themſelves and others ſo much with *School-terms*, as to leave the matter rather more obſcure than it was before. But I ſhall endeavour to make things as clear as they will bear. And that which I inſiſt upon is, that the Abſurdities are not to appearance ſo great as thoſe of Tranſubſtantiation. And therefore I deſire you to produce thoſe which appear the moſt dreadful.

P. I ſhall reduce all to theſe two, which comprehend the reſt.

1. *How there can be three Perſons and but one God.*
2. *How theſe can agree in a third, and not agree among themſelves.*

For the firſt, it ſeems very abſurd, that there ſhould be three Perſons really diſtinct, whereof every one is God, and yet there ſhould not be three Gods; for nothing is more contradictious than to make three not to be three, or three to be but one.

Pr. I hope now you will give me leave to make an Anſwer to your Difficulty, as diſtinct as poſſible. We do not ſay, that three Perſons are but one Perſon, or that one Nature is three Natures; but that there are three Perſons in one Nature. If therefore one Individual Nature be commu-

communicable to three Perſons, there is no appearance of Abſurdity in this Doctrine. And on the other ſide, it will be impoſſible there ſhould be three Gods, where there is one and the ſame Individual Nature; for three Gods muſt have three ſeveral Divine Natures, ſince it is the Divine Eſſence which makes a God. But to make this more plain, Do you make any difference between *Nature* and *Perſon*?

P. Yes.

Pr. Wherein lies it?

P. Excuſe me, Sir, for you have undertaken to explain theſe things.

Pr. I will begin with *Perſon*. Which Name was originally taken among the *Romans* from ſome remarkable diſtinction of one from another; either by ſome outward appearance, as a Vizard or Habit, or ſome particular Quality or Diſpoſition. And from hence it came to be applied to thoſe inward Properties, whereby one Intelligent Being is diſtinguiſhed from another; and from thoſe Properties, to the Perſon who had them. Thus *Perſon* is uſed even by *Tully* himſelf, at leaſt twenty times in his Books of Rhetorick: and the old Civil Law ſpeaks of *Perſonal Rights* and *Perſonal Actions*. So that the Criticks, ſuch as *Valla*, and others, had no cauſe to find fault with *Boethius*, for applying the Notion of a *Perſon*, to an *intelligent Being ſubſiſting by it ſelf*, (and ſo the Soul is no Perſon in Men, but the Man conſiſting of Soul and Body) *having ſome incommunicable Properties belonging to him*. Therefore I cannot but wonder at the niceneſs of ſome late Men, who would have the Names of *Perſon*, and *Hypoſtaſis*, and *Trinity*, to be laid aſide; ſince themſelves confeſs *Boëthius* his definition of a Perſon to be true enough; but they ſay, *it belongs to the Creatures, and not to God, for it would make three Gods*. Which is to ſuppoſe, without proving it, that the Divine Nature can

commu-

communicate it self after no other manner than a created Nature can.

This is now to be more ſtrictly enquired into. And it is very well obſerved by *Boëthius*, *de Trin. l.* 1. *Principium pluralitatis alteritas eſt: That Diverſity is the Reaſon of Plurality:* And therefore in the Trinity, ſo far as they are different, they are three, *i.e.* in regard of *Perſonal Properties and Relations*; but ſo far as they agree, they are but O N E, that is, as to the Divine Nature.

It is very true, that according to Arithmetick, *Three cannot be One, nor One Three*; but we muſt diſtinguiſh between the bare Numeration, and the Things numbred. The repetition of *three Units*, certainly makes three diſtinct Numbers; but it doth not make *three Perſons* to be *three Natures*. And therefore as to the Things themſelves, we muſt go from the bare *Numbers* to conſider their *Nature*. Where-ever there is a real diſtinction, we may multiply the Number, tho the Subject be but One. As ſuppoſe we ſay the Soul hath three Faculties, Underſtanding, Will and Memory; we may, without the leaſt abſurdity ſay, *there are Three and One*; and thoſe three not confounded with each other, and yet there is but One Soul.

P. But the *Socinians* object, that there is a difference between *three Properties*, and *three diſtinct Perſons*; becauſe a *Perſon is an Individual Being*; and ſo three Perſons muſt be three Individual Beings; and therefore as there is but one Divine Being, there can be but one Perſon.

Pr. This is the main ſtrength of the Cauſe; to which I anſwer, That altho a *Perſon* be an Individual Being, yet it implies two Things in it; (1.) Something common with others of the ſame Nature; as three Men have one and the ſame Nature, tho they be three Perſons. (2.) Something peculiar and incommunicate to any other;

ther; ſo that *John* cannot be *Peter*, nor *Peter*, *James*.

P. But what is it which makes one not to be the other, when they have the ſame common Nature?

Pr. You ask a hard Queſtion, *viz.* about the *Principle* of *Individuation*; but if it be ſo hard to reſolve it, as to created Beings, there is certainly far leſs Reaſon for us to be unſatisfied, if it appear difficult to clear the Difference of *Nature* and *Perſon* in an infinite Being. Yet all Mankind are agreed in the Thing, *viz.* That there is a Community of the ſame Nature, and a real Diſtinction of Perſons among Men, tho they cannot tell what that is which diſcriminates the Humane Nature in *John*, from the ſame Humane Nature in *Peter* and *James*. And it is obſervable, that as Beings ariſe in Perfection above each other, it is ſtill ſo much harder to aſſign that which is called the *Principle* of *Individuation*. In groſs and material Beings we can diſcern a number of Accidents, or peculiar Modes and Properties, which diſtinguiſh them from each other; but it is much harder to aſſign it in Spiritual and Intellectual Beings, whoſe Natures and Differences lie not ſo open to our Underſtandings. If ſo be then it appears more difficult in an infinite and incomprehenſible Being, what Cauſe have we to wonder at it?

But we muſt always make a difference between what we have reaſon to believe, and what we have a power to conceive. Altho we have all the Reaſon in the World to believe that there is a God, *i. e.* a Being Infinite in all Perfections; yet we muſt yield that his Eſſential Attributes are above our comprehenſion.

As for Inſtance;

(1.) We muſt believe God to be Eternal, or we cannot believe him to be God. For, if he once were not, it is impoſſible he ſhould ever be. And therefore we conclude neceſſary Exiſtence to be an Eſſential Attribute of the Divine Nature. But then, how to conceive that a

Being

Being ſhould be from it ſelf, is at leaſt as hard, as how one and the ſame Individual Nature ſhould be communicated to three diſtinct Perſons; nay, it is ſomewhat harder, ſince we ſee ſomething like this in other Beings; but we can ſee no manner of Reſemblance of a thing that hath its Being wholly from it ſelf.

(2.) We muſt allow God to be *Omnipreſent*, or elſe we muſt ſuppoſe him ſo confined and limited to a certain place, as to be excluded from any other; and if he can Act in all Places, he muſt either be preſent in them, or his Power muſt be larger than his Being, which is Infinite; but after this, we have not a Power to conceive how a Being ſhould be preſent in the whole World, and not to be extended; and if it be extended, how it ſhould be uncapable of being divided into Parts; which is certainly repugnant to the Divine Nature. I therefore produce theſe two Inſtances, to let the *Antitrinitarians* ſee, that what they object in Point of Reaſon as to the Incomprehenſibility of the Myſtery of the Trinity, will in conſequence overthrow the Divine Nature. But as there is the higheſt Reaſon to believe there is a God, tho we cannot comprehend his Perfections; ſo there may be great Reaſon to believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, tho we cannot comprehend the manner of it.

P. I had thought you intended to explain the Myſtery of it, and now you tell us it is *Incomprehenſible*.

Pr. It is a good ſtep to our believing it, to make it plain, that the Difficulty of our Conception ought not to hinder our Faith. And I have made ſome advance towards the explication of it, by ſhewing, that ſince Mankind are agreed about the difference between *Nature* and *Perſon*, the whole Difficulty comes to this, that the ſame common Nature in Mankind makes three Perſons; but that it is the ſame Individual Nature in all the Perſons of the Trinity.

And

And now let us consider the Infinite Perfection and Simplicity of the Divine Nature; and we shall think it unreasonable that it should be so bounded as to the manner of its Communication, as the Nature of Man is. Every Individual Man hath not only Individual Properties, but an Individual Nature, *i. e.* the common Nature of Man, limited by some unaccountable Principle, that doth make him different from all other Men having the same Nature with himself. The Difficulty then doth not lie in a *Community* of *Nature*, and a *Distinction* of *Persons*, for that is granted among Men, but in *the Unity of Nature* with the *difference* of *Persons*. And supposing the Divine Nature to be infinite in its Perfection, I do not see how it is capable of being bounded, as the common Nature of Man in Individuals is; and if it be not capable of being bounded and limited, it must diffuse it self into all the Persons in the same individual manner; and so this Doctrine of the *Trinity* is not repugnant to *Reason*.

P. But what say you to the *Athanasian Creed*; is not that repugnant to humane Reason?

Pr. I think not; but that it is a just Explication of the Doctrine of the *Trinity* rightly understood.

P. I see now you are upon hard Points, you will stick at nothing, and *Transubstantiation* it self will down with you anon.

Pr. I doubt that; but at present we are upon the *Athanasian Creed*. And I desire but one Principle to clear it, which follows from what is said already, *viz.* That what is affirmed of the Divine Nature, as such, must be common to all three Persons; but whatever is affirmed of the several Persons, as such, must be peculiar to themselves. Now this is a clear Principle of Reason, and hath no appearance of absurdity in it. And from hence the *Athanasian Creed* will easily be cleared. For *Eternity*, *Incomprehensibility*, *Omnipotency*, belonging to the Divine

Nature, as such, we ought to say, *That they are not three Eternals, three Incomprehensibles, three Almighties, but One Eternal, One Incomprehensible, One Almighty.* Because the Attributes belonging to the Persons, by reason of the Divine Nature, and the Attributes being really the same with it, the Nature is the proper Subject of them; which being but One, we are not to distinguish them as to *Essential Attributes*, but only as to *Personal Relations* and *Properties.*

P. But if the Three Persons be *Coëternal*, how is it possible to conceive there should not be *three Eternals?*

Pr. This seems the hardest Expression in the whole Creed; but it is to be interpreted by the Scope and Design of it: Which is, that the *Essential Attributes* are not to be distinguished, though the *Persons* be. And so *Eternity* is not taken as a *Personal Attribute*, but as *Essential*; and so they are not *three Eternals*, but *one Eternal.* And the great Design of the Creed was, to shew, that the Christian Church did not believe such a Trinity as consisted of *three Persons*, *unequal* and different in *Nature*, and *Substance*, and *Duration.*

P. But what say you to the damning all those who do not believe it, in the beginning and end of it?

Pr. This is off from our Business. But to let you see I will not avoid the Difficulties you offer, I will give an Answer even to this. The meaning is not, that every one is damned who doth not conceive aright of the Difference of Nature and Person in the Trinity, or of the Essential and Personal Attributes; but that those who set up in opposition to it the worship of a meer Creature as God, or the worship of more Gods than one, or who wilfully reject this Article of the Christian Faith, when it is duly proposed to them, are guilty of a damning Sin. For even the disbelief of Christianity it self, is not supposed to be the Cause of Mens Damnation, but where the Doctrine

of

of the Gospel hath been proposed in a way of Credibility. If when this Doctrine of the *Trinity* is proposed to Mens Minds, they will not consider it, nor weigh the Arguments on both sides impartially, but with scorn and contempt reject it, and endeavour to bring reproach upon Christianity for the sake of it, and disturb the Peace of the Church about it; such cannot be said to receive or *believe it faithfully*, and by such Sins they do run the hazard of *perishing everlastingly*.

P. I see you have a mind to smooth every thing relating to the *Trinity*, I wish you would do the same about *Transubstantiation*. But yet you have not answer'd the other great Difficulty in Point of Reason, *viz. That those things which agree or disagree in a third, must agree or disagree one with the other*. And therefore if the Father be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; then the Father must be Son and Holy Ghost, and the Son and Holy Ghost must be the Father. If not, then they are really the same, and really distinct; the same as to Essence, distinct as to Persons; and so they are the same, and not the same, which is a Contradiction.

Pr. And now I think you have drawn out the most refined Spirits of *Socinianism*, to make the Doctrine of *the Trinity* and *Transubstantiation* parallel, because you say, it implies a Contradiction; which is the nearest Parallel you have yet offered at. But this terrible Argument is grounded on the same Supposition, *viz.* That the Divine Essence is no more capable of communicating it self to three distinct Persons, than any created Being is. The Reason of that Axiom being, that created Things, by reason of their finite Nature, cannot diffuse or communicate themselves to more than one; and therefore those which agree in a Third, must agree together; but supposing it possible that the same finite Nature could extend it self to several Individuals, it would be presently answered,

the *Axiom* did hold only, where they did adequately and reciprocally agree, and not where they did agree only in Eſſence, but differ'd in the manner of Subſiſtence. For where a different manner of Subſiſtence is ſuppoſed poſſible, in the ſame Individual Nature, the Agreement in that cannot take away that Difference which is conſiſtent with it; which we attribute to the unlimitedneſs and perfection of the Divine Nature.

P. But you can bring no other Inſtance but the thing in Queſtion; and therefore this is a *Petitio Principii*, or taking that for granted which is in Diſpute.

Pr. I do not think it to be ſo, where the Reaſon is aſſigned from the peculiar Properties of the Divine Nature, to which there can be no parallel. And I think it very unreaſonable in the *Socinians*, to ſend us to created Beings for the Rules and Meaſures of our Judgment concerning a Being acknowledged to be Infinite.

P. Are not the Divine Perſons Infinite, as well as the Divine Nature? and therefore as created Perſons do take in the whole Nature, ſo infinite Perſons will do the infinite Nature.

Pr. No queſtion, but the *Perſons* are infinite in regard of the *Nature* which is ſo; but if an infinite Nature be communicable to more Perſons than One, every ſuch Perſon cannot appropriate the whole Nature to it ſelf.

P. If the difference be on the account of Infinity, then there muſt be an infinite number of Perſons in the Divine Eſſence.

Pr. I anſwer, that infiniteneſs of Number is no Perfection; and as to the number of Perſons, we follow not our own Conjectures, nor the Authority of the Church; but *Divine Revelation*, which hath aſſured us, that there is but *one God*, and yet *there are three that are one.* Which depends not meerly on the place of St. *John*, but the Form of Baptiſm is remarkable to this purpoſe, which joyns together

gether *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*; without any other diſtinction beſides that of Order and Relation. And it is againſt the fundamental deſign of Chriſtianity, to joyn any Created Beings together with God in ſo ſolemn an Act of Religion. And St. *Paul* joyns them together in his Benediction: *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all. Amen.* 2 Cor. 12. 14. From whence the Chriſtian Church hath always believed a *Trinity* of *Perſons* in the *Unity* of the *Divine Nature*.

P. You have taken a great deal of pains to clear the Doctrine of the *Trinity* from any abſurdity in point of *Reaſon*, why ſhould you not do as much now as to *Tranſubſtantiation*?

Pr. In plain truth, becauſe I cannot; for here lies a vaſt difference between them. In the *Trinity* we conſider'd an *Infinite Being*, to which no bounds can be ſet without deſtroying its Nature; but in *Tranſubſtantiation*, we ſuppoſe a true finite Body, which hath its natural bounds and limits to one certain Place, and yet you will and muſt ſuppoſe this Body to be equally preſent in many thouſand diſtant Places at the ſame time; which implies ſo great a Repugnancy to the very Nature of a Body, that I can by no means give my Aſſent to it.

P. Alas! Is this it which chokes your Reaſon, ſo that you cannot ſwallow the Doctrine of the Church in this matter?

You do not conſider, that tho we allow nothing *Infinite* in the *Body* it ſelf; yet we ſuppoſe an *Infinite Power* to be imploy'd about it: and an Infinite Power may produce things above our Comprehenſions, about Bodies in themſelves finite.

Pr. This is the utmoſt your Cauſe will bear; but I pray tell me, Is there any ſuch thing as a Repugnancy in the Nature of things or not? *i. e.* Are there not ſome things

things which are endued with ſuch Properties, that if you alter them, your deſtroy their very Nature; as, to ſuppoſe an indiviſible Line, a Triangle without Lines, a Body without Dimenſions?

P. Hold a little; a Body muſt have Dimenſions belonging to it, but it is not neceſſary it ſhould have thoſe Dimenſions where-ever it is preſent. For it may be preſent in one Place *as a Body*, and in another *after the manner of a Spirit*.

Pr. You might as well have ſaid, a Body may be conſider'd two ways; as it is a Body, and as it is not a Body: for there can be no Body, where there are no Dimenſions proper to it.

P. See how you are miſtaken; for *it is not the Dimenſions which ſeem to hinder a Body being in more places at once, but its Unity*; as *Bellarmin* well obſerves.

Pr. I ſay both of them hinder. For a true Body can no more be without its Dimenſions, than a Line without Diviſibility.

P. I grant, that naturally it cannot, but *by Divine Power* it may.

Pr. Will you make the Power of God to change the Eſſential Properties of things, while the things themſelves remain in their true Nature? You may as well ſay, that naturally Man is a Reaſonable Creature; but by Divine Power he may be a true Man, and yet want the Faculty of Reaſoning: That naturally two and two make four, but God can make two and two to be joyned together in a ſupernatural manner, ſo as that four ſhall not reſult from them; that tho, naturally ſpeaking, white-waſhing a Wall makes it look white, yet by an extraordinary Power, there may be the preſence of all things which make a Wall white, yet it ſhall not do ſo; juſt ſo it is to make a Body preſent, and yet to have no Dimenſions of a Body. Is there any real difference between the

Nature

Nature of a Body and Spirit? Wherein lies it? Is it not as repugnant for a Body to be after the manner of a Spirit, as for a Body and Spirit to be the ſame?

P. All this proceeds upon not conſidering the difference between the *Eſſential Extenſion* of a *Body*, and that which is *quantitative, and hath relation to Place.*

Pr. The *Eſſential Extenſion* of a Body without *Quantity*, is Non-ſenſe, and a Contradiction. For it is to make a Body extended and not extended, at the ſame time. I pray tell me what you mean by *a Body*, as it is oppoſed to *a Spirit?*

P. I mean as all Mankind do, ſuch a Subſtance which conſiſts of Parts extended and diviſible.

Pr. Then being extended and diviſible, are the natural and eſſential Properties of a Body. And therefore, to ſuppoſe a Body not to be extended and diviſible, is to ſuppoſe it not to be a Body, which is a plain Contradiction.

P. You are to diſtinguiſh between *the Intrinſecal Quantity*, which is an inſeparable Property of a Body, and the *Extrinſecal Relation* it hath to a Place.

Pr. Intrinſecal Quantity without Relation to Place, is *intrinſecal Non-ſenſe.* For, how is it poſſible for extended Parts to have no Relation to Place?

P. By *Relation to Place*, I mean, when the Parts of a Body anſwer to the Parts of a Place: but by *Intrinſecal Quantity*, I mean, that there is the real order and proportion of Parts in the Body it ſelf, but it doth not fill up the Place.

Pr. Then you do ſuppoſe the Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, to have all the diſtinct Parts of a Body, with their due Order and Proportion, but to be in the Sacrament after an indiviſible manner.

P. Why not?

Pr.

Pr. Do you think it possible for the real and entire Body of a Man to be crouded into the compass of a Wafer, with all the difference of its Parts, so that no true Part of the Body be missing?

P. Yes, by Divine Power.

Pr. Do you think a far less thing possible than that, *viz.* that a Man's Head, and Shoulders, and Arms, should be contained entire and distinct under the Nail of his little Finger?

P. Why not?

Pr. Then why may not the greatest Body be within the least? Why may not an Elephant be caught in a Mouse-trap, and a Rhinoceros be put into a Snuff-box? For either there is a Repugnancy in the Nature of the thing, for a greater Body to be within a less, or there is not; if not, then these mentioned Instances are possible; if there be, then the supposition of Divine Power can give no relief, unless you suppose, that God can do things repugnant in themselves, *i. e.* that he can do things which cannot be done. But I pray tell me, if the very Body of Christ be by *Transubstantiation* in the Wafer, with all its Parts in their due order, then the Head must be distant from the Feet, and all the other *Organs* in their proper places; but this cannot possibly be supposed, where there is no measure of distance as *Place* is, and the whole Body is in a point.

P. I say again, there is the just order of Parts considered *in themselves*, but not *with respect to Place.*

Pr. Then it is impossible there should be any distance; without which it is impossible there should be the order of Parts in a Human Body. Thus, there is a Repugnancy in the very supposition of Christ's Body being in the Wafer, tho there were but one single Wafer; but when to this we add, that it is equally thus present in thousands of Wafers at what distance of Place soever, the Absurdities

dities do increaſe and multiply ſo faſt upon us, that it is hardly poſſible to imagin any thing concerning a Body, which doth imply more than this doth. As that *one* and the ſame Body ſhould be indiviſibly preſent in many places, where it muſt be divided from it ſelf, by ſo many Bodies interpoſing: ſo that it is impoſſible to apprehend how two Bodies can be divided from one another more effectually, than ſuch a Body muſt be from it ſelf, if it be preſent in many places at once.

Pr. I pray ſtop here; for reckon up as many Abſurdities as you will, they are all but the Effects of *Carnal Reaſon*, and we muſt *captivate our Underſtanding to the Obedience of Faith.*

Pr. Then it is to no purpoſe to argue any farther, on the point of *Reaſon*; and I thought you deſigned this for one part of your *Parallel.*

P. So I did; and I ſtill ſay, there are things as hard to make out about the *Trinity*, which you have not yet taken notice of.

Pr. I pray let us hear them, that we may put an end to this Diſcourſe.

P. What ſay you then to one and the ſame Nature being in three diſtinct Perſons, which *Bellarmin* ſaith, *is more wonderful, than that one Body ſhould be in many Places; becauſe the Nature is identified with the Perſons, but the Body is not ſo with the Places in which it is preſent.* If therefore the ſame Nature be not divided from it ſelf in the Perſons of the Trinity, how much more eaſily may one Body be preſent in ſeveral places, and not be divided from it ſelf?

Pr. It is ſtrange neither *Bellarmin* nor you ſhould diſcern the difference. For the reaſon why a Body muſt be divided from it ſelf, being in ſeveral places, is, becauſe it is finite; and there being no Penetration of Dimenſions in

Bodies, the interpoſing of other Bodies muſt needs divide the ſame Body in diſtant places; but the Reaſon why the ſame Divine Nature may be in ſeveral Perſons, is, becauſe it is Infinite; and therefore nothing can bound or diſcontinue it.

P. You have talked much of Contradictions; Is there any greater about Tranſubſtantiation, than that of *Eternal Generation* of the Son in the *Myſtery* of the *Trinity*? for, if it be not *proper Generation*, then you cannot infer from it, that *the Son is of the ſame Subſtance with the Father*; if it be, then it muſt be a proceeding from not being to being, and ſo *an Eternal Generation* is a Contradiction.

Pr. It is a Rule in common Reaſon, That all Attributes muſt be underſtood according to the Nature of the Subjects. And therefore, if the Subject here ſpoken of, be of ſuch a Nature, as to be uncapable of proceeding from *not being to being*, then whatever is affirmed of it, muſt be ſo underſtood, as not to deſtroy its Nature. The Term of Generation alone is not, it may be, ſufficient to prove the Son Co-eſſential with the Father, becauſe it might have been uſed improperly and metaphorically. But when from the Scripture, it otherwiſe appears that the Son of God being *the Word, was in the beginning with God, and was God*, John 1. 1. and we ſoon after find him called *the only begotten of the Father*, Ver. 14. and *the only begotten Son*, Ver. 18. we have reaſon to infer from hence his *Eternal Generation*. Which muſt not be underſtood in ſuch a mean ſenſe as is agreeable to Creatures, but as it is conſiſtent with the Eſſential Attributes of God, of which neceſſary Exiſtence is one. So that by Eternal Generation, no more can be meant, than ſuch an Emanation of the Son from the Father, as doth ſuppoſe them to have the ſame Nature and Co-exiſtence: which

is

is beſt repreſented by the Rays of the Sun coming from the Fountain of Light, if they were permanent, and not ſucceſſive.

P. What ſay you then to the *Myſtery* of the *Incarnation? Is it not more wonderful*, as *Bellarmin* obſerves, *that there ſhould be one Hypoſtaſis in two Natures, than one Body in two Places? ſince the Union is greater between the Hypoſtaſis and the Natures, than between the Body and the Places it is in; the one being intrinſecal and ſubſtantial, the other extrinſecal and accidental. And that Hypoſtaſis is the ſame with the Divine Nature, and yet is moſt cloſely united with the Human Nature, which is ſo different from the Divine; ſo that it is incomprehenſible by us, how in that Union the Natures are not confounded, or the Hypoſtaſis divided.*

Pr. Suppoſe now we grant all this, that there is an incomprehenſible Myſtery in the *Incarnation*, what follows from thence? Have I not hitherto owned, that there muſt be ſomething incomprehenſible by us, in what relates to the Divine Nature? And it is the leſs wonder it is ſo in the *Incarnation*, wherein an Union is implied between an Infinite and Finite Nature; when the Union of the Soul and Body, though both Finite, is above our Comprehenſion, though we our ſelves conſiſt of Souls and Bodies ſo united? But what Conſequence is it, if we are not able to explain this, that then we muſt admit that the ſame Body may be not meerly in two, but in ten thouſand places at the the ſame time? *i. e.* If we cannot explain the *Hypoſtatical Union*, then all manner of Abſurdities muſt go down with us, that relate to things of a very different Nature from it.

P. I am glad to find you are ſet at laſt, and that now you have a Difficulty before you which you can never get through.

Pr. Be not too confident; I have only hitherto denied the Conſequence as to the Difficulties of *Tranſubſtantiation*. But it is poſſible, that ſetting aſide the Confuſion of *School-Terms*, I may be able to give a far more intelligible and reaſonable Account of the *Incarnation* it ſelf, than you can ever do of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

P. Firſt ſhew that it is poſſible, and then explain the manner of it.

Pr. But let us in the firſt place agree what we mean by it.

P. By the *Incarnation*, I mean, the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature, ſo as to make one Perſon in Chriſt.

Pr. If this be not poſſible, it muſt either be, 1. Becauſe two Natures different from each other, cannot be united to make one Perſon: The contrary whereof appears in the union of Soul and Body to the Perſon of a Man. Or, 2. becauſe it is impoſſible that an Infinite Nature ſhould be united to a Finite.

P. How can there be an Union poſſible, between two Beings infinitely diſtant from each other?

Pr. Not in that reſpect wherein the *Diſtance* is *Infinite*; but if there be nothing deſtructive to either Nature in ſuch an Union, and the Infinite Nature do condeſcend to it, why may it not be ſo united to an Intelligent Finite Being, as to make one Perſon together with it? For in reſpect of Union, the Diſtance is not ſo great between *Finite* and *Infinite*, as between *Body* and *Spirit*.

P. The Diſtance is Infinite in one Caſe, but not in the other.

Pr. I do not ſpeak of them, with Reſpect to *Perfections*, but to *Union*; and an infinite Diſtance in that muſt imply an abſolute Repugnancy, which you can never prove:

prove: For, since *Body* and *Spirit* may be united to make one Person, an Infinite Spirit may be united to a Finite Nature.

P. But the manner of the *Hypostatical Union* is impossible to be conceived.

Pr. Let the thing be granted possible, and the difficulty of conceiving the manner may be as great in the Union of Soul and Body. Will you undertake to explain that to me? and yet I hope you believe it. But, let us hear your Difficulties again, which you object from *Bellarmine*.

P. That there should be but one Hypostasis in two Natures; and that in the Union the Natures should not be confounded, nor the Hypostasis divided.

Pr. All these Difficulties arise from the sense of the word *Hypostasis*. Which originally signifies *a Real Being*, and not such which depends only on Fancy and Imagination; from thence its signification was enlarged, not only to *things real*, (in opposition to meer Appearances, and Creatures of the Mind) but to such a thing *which did subsist of it self*, and had not its subsistence in another, as Accidents had. So that an *Hypostasis* was *a real Substance which had subsistence in it self*. But such are of two kinds, as the Greek Fathers observe. (1.) Such as are real Substances in themselves, but yet are capable of being joined with another, to make up a Person; thus the *Soul* and *Body* have two different *Hypostases*, and make up but *one Person* of a Man. (2.) It is taken, for a *compleat individual Subsistence, which is not joined with any other as a Part*; and so *Hypostasis* is the same with *a Person*, which is nothing else but *a compleat, intelligent, individual Hypostasis*. And in this sense there can be but one *Hypostasis* in Christ, *i. e.* one Person, tho there be two Natures.

P. But our Divines say, that the Humane Nature after the Union hath no *Hypostasis*, it being swallowed up by the Divine.

Pr.

Pr. I know they do; but if they mean that the Humane Nature, after the Union, loſes that *ſubſiſtente* which is proper to the *Humane Nature*, it is impoſſible for them to avoid the *Eutychian Hereſy*, condemned by the Council of *Chalcedon*; but if they mean no more than that there is *a true Nature*, but no Perſon, ſave only that which reſults from both Natures; they then agree with the Senſe of the Church, which condemned the *Eutychians*. For as much as the Hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches* differ'd in themſelves, they were both built on the ſame Ground, *viz.* that there could be no true Nature, but there muſt be a Perſon; and that two Natures could not make one Perſon. From whence *Neſtorius* aſſerted there were *two Perſons in Chriſt*; and *Eutyches* denied that there were *two Natures*.

P. What doth all this ſignify, but that the Authority of the Church muſt determine whether there be *two Natures*, or *two Perſons* in Chriſt?

Pr. It ſeems then, the whole Buſineſs wherein the General Councils were ſo warmly concerned, was only to make an *Eccleſiaſtical Dictionary*, and to appoint what words are to be uſed, and what not. Do you think then, there were no ſuch *real Hereſies* as *Neſtorianiſm* and *Eutychianiſm*, but only they happened to take the words *Nature* and *Perſon* in another ſenſe than the Church would have Men uſe them?

P. I truſt the Church for all theſe things.

Pr. Then if the Church would have you affirm *two Perſons* and *one Nature*, or *two Natures* and *one Perſon*, it were all one to you.

P. Why not? ſince the Church muſt determine.

Pr. What if you had been to diſpute with *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*?

P. I would have told them, they muſt ſubmit to the *Church* about the uſe of words.

Pr.

Pr. And they would have laughed at you for your pains: For the Controverſy was really about the *Truth* of *Chriſt's Incarnation*, (as the Fathers proved, and the Councils determined) which in Conſequence was rejected by both of them; as I will evidently prove, if you have any longer Patience.

P. I beg your pardon, Sir, I have heard enough of all Conſcience already.

Pr. I think ſo too, to make you aſhamed of your Parallel between the *Doctrine of the Trinity, and Tranſubſtantiation.*

And methinks, for the ſake of our common Chriſtianity, you ſhould no more venture upon ſuch bold and unreaſonable Compariſons. Do you in earneſt think, it is all one, whether Men do believe a God, or Providence, or Heaven, or Hell, or the Trinity and Incarnation of Chriſt, if they do not believe *Tranſubſtantiation?* We have heard much of late about *Old and New Popery*; but if this be the way of *Repreſenting New Popery*, by expoſing the common Articles of Faith; it will ſet the Minds of all good Chriſtians farther from it than ever. For upon the very ſame Grounds, we may expect another Parallel between the *belief of a God* and *Tranſubſtantiation*; the effect of which will be, the expoſing of all Religion. This is a very deſtructive and miſchievous Method of Proceeding; but our comfort is, that it is very *unreaſonable*; as I hope, hath fully appeared by this Diſcourſe.

FINIS.

Errata *omitted in the former Dialogue.*

PAge 10. line 25, dele *not.*
18. l. 2, dele *not.*
14. Marg. l. 8. read λαμβανόμενον.

In this Dialogue.

PAge 4. line 5. read *viz. the Sacrament.*
5. l. 19. for *dont*, r. *dut.*
8. l. 30. for *fictitious*, r. *factitious.*
23. l. 22. r. *doubted as will.*

Books Printed for William Rogers.

THE Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* truly Represented; in Answer to a Book intituled, A Papist Mis-represented and Represented, &c. *Quarto.*

An Answer to a Discourse intituled, Papists Protesting against Protestant Popery; being a Vindication of Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants: and containing a particular Examination of Monsieur *de Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in the Articles of Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images, occasioned by that Discourse. *Quarto.*

An Answer to the Amicable Accommodation of the Difference between the Representer and Answerer. *Quarto.*

A View of the whole Controversy between the Representer and the Answerer, with an Answer to the Representer's last Reply; in which are laid open some of the Methods by which Protestants are Misrepresented by Papists. *Quarto.*

A Discourse against Transubstantiation, in *Octavo.* price 3*d.*

Sermons and Discourses, some of which never before printed; the third Volume. By the Reverend Dr. *Tillotson* Dean of *Canterbury.* 8*o.*

A Manuel for a Christian Soldier. Written by *Erasmus*, and Translated into English. *Twelvo.*

The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation, compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition. In a new Dialogue between a Protestant and a Papist. The first Part. Wherein an Answer is given to the late Proofs of the Antiquity of Transubstantiation, in the Books called *Consensus Veterum*, *& Nubes Testium*, &c. *Quarto.*

The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared, as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition. In a new Dialogue between a Protestant and a Papist. The second Part. Wherein the Doctrine of the Trinity is shewed to be agreeable to Scripture and Reason, and Transubstantiation repugnant to both. *Quarto.*